DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 314 EA 005 421

TITLE	Journal of Proceedings. National Association of State Boards of Education.
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Boards of Education, Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE	Oct 72
NOTE	96p.; Speeches given before National Association of State Boards of Education Annual Convention (12th, Des Moines, Iowa, October 14-18, 1972)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports, Court Cases; *Educational Finance; *Equal Education; *Full State Funding; Measurement; *School Taxes; *State Boards of Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Assessment; Rodriguez; Serrano

ABSTRACT

Addresses by noteworthy educational experts comprise the bulk of this report. The main subjects covered by the speakers include full State funding, the Serrano and Rodriguez cases on educational finance, and National Assessment. Business meeting minutes and resolutions are presented in the appendixes. (JF)

ED 082314

NASBE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Journal of Proceedings

EA 005 421

1972 Convention
Des Moines, Iowa
October 14 - 18

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ORDER OF CONTENTS

Convention Registrants

Speeches

Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.
Paul N. Ylvisaker
Gregory R. Anrig
William G. Saltonstall
William R. MacDougall
Richard A. Rossmiller
R. Stephen Browning
James A. Hazlett
Paul B. Campbell
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.
Governor Robert D. Ray
Virla R. Krotz

Appendix I

Minutes of Annual Business Meeting

1972-73 Budget

Appendix II

Courtesy Resolution

Appendix III

Policy Resolutions

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
Annual Convention - October 14-18, 1972
Des Moines, Iowa

REGISTRANTS

ALABAMA

Isabelle B. Thomasson

CALIFORNIA

Virla R. Krotz

COLORADO

Allen B. Lamb
Lewis E. Stieghorst

CONNECTICUT

William Horowitz

DELAWARE

Elise Grossman
Robert H. McBride

GEORGIA

Mrs. A. Edward Smith
Ernest S. Whaley

GUAM

Leonard Faria

HAWAII

George Adachi
Ruth Tabrah
Kiyoto Tsubaki

ILLINOIS

Dr. James Wilson

INDIANA

John B. Stone

IOWA

Stanley R. Barber
Robert J. Beecher
Virginia Harper
T. J. Heronimus
Muriel I. Shepard
Mrs. Earl G. Sievers
John E. van der Linden

KANSAS

Dorothy Ballard
Harold H. Crist
Dorothy G. Groesbeck
Harry O. Lytle, Jr.
Karl M. Wilson

KENTUCKY

E. W. Whiteside, Sr.

MAINE

Dana R. Darling

MASSACHUSETTS

Rae Cecilia Kipp

MICHIGAN

Gorton Riethmiller

MINNESOTA

Daniel F. Burton
Richard L. Bye

NEBRASKA

Allen P. Burkhardt
Shirley A. Peterson

NEVADA

Rosemary Clarke
Cynthia W. Cunningham
Robert I. Rose

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Donald E. Borchers

NEW JERSEY

Calvin J. Hurd

NEW YORK

Theodore M. Black
Joseph W. McGovern
Regent Harold Newcomb
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.
Mrs. Kenneth T. Power

NORTH CAROLINA

Craig Phillips
Dr. Harold L. Trigg

NORTH DAKOTA

Richard Hilborn
Arthur S. Johnson
Sam L. Kessler

OHIO

Patrick L. Cooney
Wayne E. Shaffer
F. W. Spicer

OKLAHOMA

Harry Shackelford

OREGON

Eugene H. Fisher
Francis I. Smith

PENNSYLVANIA

Paul S. Christman
James H. Rowland, Sr.
Leonard N. Wolf

PUERTO RICO

Reece B. Bothwell

SOUTH CAROLINA

E. B. Stoudemire

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ben A. Anderson
Emil A. Koehn

TENNESSEE

Edward L. Jennings
James H. Jones, Jr.

TEXAS

James W. Harvey
Ben R. Howell
Herbert O. Willborn

UTAH

Erna S. Ericksen
Esther R. Landa
John L. Owen
Helen B. Ure

VERMONT

Arlina Pat Hunt

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Sidney Lee

WASHINGTON

Grant L. Anderson

WEST VIRGINIA

W. Robert Abbot
Mrs. C. W. Bartram
James P. Geary
Perce J. Ross
E. L. Snoderley
Fountie N. Williams

WISCONSIN

Donald E. Dimick

WYOMING

Del Northcutt

Friends of N.A.S.B.E.

Gregory R. Anrig	University of Massachusetts,Boston,Mass.
Harold J. Alford	Educational Testing Service,Princeton, N.J.
R. Stephen Browning	Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Laws, Wash, D.C.
Paul B. Campbell	General Testing Service, New Jersey
William N. Cassela	National Municipal League, New York
Robert E. Carter	Program Director, Education Testing Service
Ella Mae Flippen	Secretary, Missouri State Bd. of Education
Fred F. Harcleroad	American College Testing Program, Iowa
James A. Hazlett	Education Commission of the States, Colorado
Dr. Byron W. Hansford	CCSSO - Wash, D.C.
Dr. Wayne O. Reed	U.S. Office of Education, Wash, D.C.
Charles B. Saunders, Jr.	U.S. Office of Education, Wash, D.C.
Dr. Helen Hartle	Interstate Certification Project, New York
Henry Heydt, Jr.	Special Asst.to State Bd. of Education,Calif.
David L. Jesser	Improving State Leadership in Education,Colo.
Edgar L. Morphet	Improving State Leadership in Education,Colo.
William R. MacDougall	Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Wash,D.C.
Maurice B. Mitchell	University of Denver, Colorado
Elizabeth Mallory	National Congress of Parents & Teachers,N.Y.
Dan McLean	Student Representative, Oregon
F.E. (Bud) Phillips	National School Boards Association, Iowa
Wendell H. Pierce	Education Commission of the States, Colo.
Hon. Robert D. Ray	Governor of State of Iowa
Richard A. Rossmiller	University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin
Maridee Sensell	Secretary, I.S.L.E., Colo.
John E. Snyder	Asst.Commissioner,State Dept of Educ.,Kansas
Severino Stefanon	Exec.Secretary,Pennsylvania State Board
John A. Sessions	American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Org., Wash, D.C.
Gessie Gerstenberger	Educationa' Coordinator, Iowa
D Gene Watson	Illinois State University
Dr. Louis Valbracht	St. John's Lutheran Church, Iowa
Paul N. Ylvisaker	Harvard University, Mass.
Robert D. Benton	CCSO - Iowa
E.C. Stimbert	CCSO - Tennessee
Daniel B. Taylor	CCSO - West Virginia
Father Hillory Gaul	Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Iowa
The Rev. Robert B. Hedges	St. Timothy's Episcopal Church, Iowa
William G.Saltonstall	Member,President's Commission on School Finance, Mass.

Address Delivered By
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 16, 1972

First General Session

Distinguished speakers, presentors, panelists, honored guests; and most importantly, fellow members and friends in the National Association of State Boards of Education. Warm and heart-felt welcome to all of you to the NASBE 1972 annual convention, which is now officially open, as NASBE is completing its 12th year.

NASBE is a service organization; and this aspect of NASBE is one that has been stressed over the past 12 months. The type of program used at each of the four area conferences was designed specifically for "in-service" type of training and experience-swapping for state board members. You wanted time for participation; you received it at those conferences; discussion material was mailed to you ahead of time.

We have programmed this convention along similar lines. Various types of material have been available to all of you before your arrival in Des Moines: FOCUS, which we hope will get more informational and useful as time goes on; the NASBE Title V booklet "Six Crucial Issues in Education"; mailings of publications produced by other groups, of which an example is "Understanding Education's Financial Dilemma"; and, of course, the daily, weekly, monthly and other news media. Things are happening so fast in education today that two-day's fishing and you've missed some significant educational development.

Last evening many of you will have met with representatives from a good many of the institutions listed on the back page of the Convention program. At one time or another over the past 12 months, NASBE has been in touch with, swapped ideas with and/or worked closely with all the institutions listed. As the role of the states becomes increasingly significant by virtue of a plethora of federal legislation, of Commission Reports and/or court decisions, the strength of NASBE -- based as it is at the state level-- must be sustained-- in no small part through constant cooperation with other major educational groups. During NASBE's 12th year, we have all been committed to broadening NASBE's roster of official friends, concurrently with the strengthening of its service functions.

As NASBE broadened its range and scope of operations -- without increasing its budget or your state's dues, it was

at times disheartening to uncover quite often expressions of concern by various leaders that volunteers occupying influential posts in the governmental process are often not in tune with the times. More insidious is the growing tendency not only by professionals by also by sadly uninformed laymen to downgrade voluntary action in many fields. Voluntary action by dedicated citizens is one of the hallmarks of the strong pluralistic characteristics of our system of federalism. Traditionally, our pluralism has remained strong because of the prime motivation, interest and dedication of lay people, willing and able to devote time to our nation's development, especially in the areas of health, welfare and education.

Lay volunteers represent stability and strength. A good volunteer - which in context here means a good state board member - is innovative and daring for the future; yet socially conscious and responsive to current needs. And state board members must add to their decision-making stamina the ability to select, and present with adequate emphasis, the priorities currently needed to enhance the quality of education.

Strong universities and colleges have unequivocally deplored the overall strategy, methods and attitudes of unreasonable militancy displayed by a very small percentage of young people; whose coverage by the media far, far, outstrips their real potency. Strong institutions -- where so many of our fine teachers are prepared -- realistically recognize that our young people today want to be heard. These institutions understand that the plea of our young people is to break away from the often almost stifling atmosphere of drabness surrounding them physically and intellectually in the educational process. Our young people have really laid the finger upon the fundamental difficulties of education always being so routinely produced in the present for future use by those trained in the past.

This is not an easy challenge to meet. Be it at the under-graduate, or graduate level, the deanship of a school of education today is a "hard-hat" job. At a place like Harvard, the magnitude of decanal responsibilities staggers the imagination. A good university president spends an enormous amount of time and effort selecting a dean. President Pusey found Dean Bok; and President Bok found our keynote speaker.

Some months back while discussing potential major speakers at his convention with some friends, remembered a young fellow then working at Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs where he had rubbed shoulders with my great -- and late -- intimate friend and educational advisor, Jim Allen; who always spoke glowingly of Paul.

It is hard to realize that it is already a year ago today the whole world of education -- and especially NASBE and the involved citizen -- lost a true friend and champion.

Our keynoter was with the Public Affairs Program at the Ford Foundation from 1955 to 1967, serving as director of the program for 8 years. It was during this period that our paths first crossed. Paul was tapped in 1967 by the Governor to be the first Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs; whence he went to Woodrow Wilson in 1970. These are but the barest essentials of a busy and most useful career. Could go on for some little time about Paul -- and his lovely wife, Barbara, who, as I promised the NASBE first lady I would mention, is also a Radcliffe girl -- but I refer you to page 3505 of the 37th edition of Who's Who in America.

First dealings about being a NASBE convention speaker were barely afloat when I heard through the grapevine that the new president of Harvard had selected Paul to become Dean of the Graduate School of Education. It is great to have him here at NASBE, where he can share that current remark: "You can always tell a Harvard man, but you can't tell him much!"

From his educational background, experiences as a senior officer of a great foundation, as a public servant at the state level, he knows all about the workings of our system of federalism which assigns to each level of government -- local, state and federal -- those duties it best performs for the greatest number of citizens; and is thoroughly familiar with the pluralism of our society. Above all, he has worked in both the public and private sector and understands the nature of our method of having policy boards largely made up of lay volunteers.

With pride, with pleasure, and with great affection, it is a privilege to present to you the keynote speaker for the NASBE 1972 Convention: Dr. Paul N. Ylvisaker.

Address Delivered By
Dr. Paul N. Ylvisaker
at the Annual Convention of the
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 16, 1972

I would like to speak today in the spirit of two men. One is Jim Allen whom I came to know too late in my life, after he had left the federal service and came to Princeton to work with students who loved him as everybody did. We had offices just down the hall from each other, but we had more than that in common. I was another public official who had been "fired" from a public commissionership for getting out of line with political leaders who were catering to a growingly conservative public mood.

Jim and I both knew we couldn't be what we were and last long in that political climate. What I respected about Jim was that he wasn't bitter about it. He knew that public life was a relay race-- we each get a lap and then pass the baton. Though we'd run another if given half a chance. There are two qualities, I suppose that make a good administrator and public servant. One is the instinct for survival and the other is the instinct to know when to drop the first instinct. As I said I wish I had gotten to know him earlier, simply because he could have given me more advice on the first. His public career was far longer than mine. He was a great man, and great especially for the positive qualities of leadership which he showed. Jim could take just about any circumstance and turn it into the positive.

I mentioned that I would be speaking in the spirit of two men; the second was my father. He was president of a small Lutheran Junior College, Bethany College of Mankato, Minnesota after being a minister in Madison, Wisconsin. I can still remember when he brought the family to this new adventure. The year was 1930, just months after this the stock market crashed. Everything was going to hell, particularly out here in the midwest.

We drove into Mankato, Minnesota after the usual four flat tires on the way from Madison. My mother with five kids and a pastor's salary was hoping this would be a move up the ladder. But it didn't take us long to find out otherwise. The college was $80,000 in debt, there were 530 students, and those 530 were spread over four years of high school and two years of junior college. The only house to live in was a little ranshackle place, which wasn't even up to the par of a parsonage. The teachers hadn't been paid for months, except for pittances which kept them alive. Well, father came into that with great enthusiasm as only I think a minister who knew God was listening to his prayers could. While his family grimly tallied problems, Dad counted them as blessings, one by one. He proceeded to

administer that college over a 20 year period, until he too got unthroned. (You know what always happens to people who accentuate the positive--But so what? The alternative is to be negative and unhappy all the time.) During those 20 years it wasn't that he produced a college all that much bigger, or that much grander. But as I go around now and meet the kids who went through that school, they all were given a bit of salt that has never lost its savor. They remember the gift of being able to turn adversity into invention. It is in that spirit I would like to talk to you this morning.

You have done magnificently in identifying the six major issues in education. You stopped on the "sixth day," probably out of weariness. So while the creator rests, I'll roll up my sleeves and go to work on the seventh.

I think the seventh great issue of American education is the reaffirmation of the importance of education--the reaffirmation of what we can do about its problems and the problems of the society around us.

We'll all have to start from the proposition that none of us has enough money to buy our way out of these problems--not even those of us who come from Harvard. I know the ledgers show the University has a whopping $1.4 billion in endowment. But it also has a convenient rule ("every tub on its own botton"). That keeps me and my fellow-Deans from getting any real piece of that action. We're left hustling like the rest of you on a tightening market. Also, Harvard is no less vulnerable than any affluent and prominent institution to the social earth quakes that are shaking the world these days. Probably more: the higher you are , the more the structure rocks and the farther you have to fall.

I will speak, therefore, to your condition because I know that every state and every state board these days faces a very tough circumstance of survival. (I'll speak to your condition, too, because I have deposited my kids all over these United States. (One of my children is being educated in North Carolina, one in Florida, one in Hawaii, one in Massachusetts. All of them got started in school in Pennsylvania and New Jersey.)

Let me begin on the bleaker side. If we are to convert rugged realities into progress, we might as well face them soon and directly. Obviously Number 1 is the reality of shrinking resources and rising costs. For the next 50 years, mankind will be living in this circumstance. You have probably read "The Limits of Growth" by J. Forrester. It is an ominous look forward into the years 2000 and 2020. This is only one of a growing volume of forecasts that the coming decades will be "squeaking through" times for the human race. We are faced with rising costs and expectations as the same time our shares of resources (and in some cases, resources themselves) are shrinking. These forecasts

may be wrong; indeed, we may be able, through technology, of continuously expanding resources and per capita income. Even then, one has to deal with "paradoxical poverty"--the ironic law we've learned so well during these past three decades of affluence--i.e. the richer you get, the more you want and spend and get committed to and have to maintain and replace. It's the same old paradox found in the Greek myth about Sissyphus: the higher you roll the stone up hill, the heavier it gets.

Take a look at your house, how many electric motors do you have? I estimated mine once for a Soviet doctor; when I guessed I had 20, he said I was lying. As a matter of fact, I undercounted by 20. If you take every motor from electric shaver to washing machine to furnace fan you'll come to the same total. We buy them one by one on an initial cost basis. Buth then the maintenance and replacement costs set in. Something needs repair every month. That little fan in the bathroom was supposed to last 10 years, but lasted only eight.

Across all our tastes and possessions, we begin to pick up the accumulated costs of affluence. The first car becomes a second car and they produce highways and suburbs, which produce kids who were born on wheels. All these initial costs become continuing obligations and both keep accumulating without adequate provision in our private and public budgets. Affluence begets "poverty". We've bought more than we can continue to afford.

The first harsh reality, then, is that of tightening budgets. The second grows at least partly from the first: a negative set of public moods and attitudes. The most negative among us are often the wealthiest, saying we will not pay any more taxes. But that negativism is everywhere, and is always searching for a rationale. Recently, the nation has been getting some clear-eyed reports on the performance of our schools. They are being interpreted to say "really all that money spent on schools and through schools doesn't make much of a difference." Now the Jencks report--the latest in the series--seems to be saying the same thing and even more emphatically: "if you thought putting those kids in school was going to give them income equality later on, forget it."

Public attitudes being as negative as they are, these reports are quickly seized upon to justify further budget cuts and growing tax revolts.

Last night I got a call from an old friend, Sam Lubell who came to Iowa to interview farmers around the state. It was a little bit too late for me to get up and have that last drink with him but I held him for a moment on the phone. "Sam quick, give me a summary of what you are finding." His reply: "There is a disturbing trend--or at least impression I have--which adds up to what I'd call 'selfish individualism.' Americans, in the

name of everything holy, are increasingly expressing individualism as a justification for selfish calculations."

Another friend of mine--Graham Finney--has just resigned as New York City's chief battler against drug abuse. He would not stay on the job where the political pressures were to say that we had methadone or other immediate solutions to drug problems. Instead, what he said is, "Let's face the basic problem of people who are surplus in our society. There is no place for them. Politicians--having no inexpensive remedies--are callously ready to write off a growing fraction of our citizenry by a combination of demagogic toughness and coin-machine therapy."

Beyond negativism, a third of the harsh realities we deal with is a sense of public and governmental impotence. The individual citizen long ago came to believe he can't solve public problems by himself, and now he's almost equally sure that government can't either. The confidence and hope exuded by the Kennedy and early Johnson administrations has evaporated. The password now is "try nothing, spend nothing, doubt everything."

A fourth reality is a growing sense of anarchy--a feeling often clearly grounded in fact that "no one is in charge; institutions of every kind are out of control." Anyone who has held high office in large and complex organizations knows that feeling. Despite the mythology of authority, being an executive doesn't mean you can order or even get things done.

In the swirl of this anarchic complexity, emerges the fifth and last of the harsh realities we deal with: a dissolving of communal ties and responsibilities into a cynical code of "I've got mine, now you get yours." Taking care of Number 1 becomes the accepted rule of personal and public behavior--and fair warning to the idealistic citizen or public official who might assume otherwise.

These are five of the harsher facts we live with--or rather, harsh interpretations of the facts. But I promised I would speak in the spirit of two men who dealt with facts positively and creatively.

So let's take another and more sanguine look,

Fact Number One: Shrinking resources. There is no doubt that budgets are and will remain tight. But that does not mean that we cannot grow and create and build and innovate. Quite the contrary--more Spartan circumstance not only can but will force us to be more genuinely inventive. Necessity, by Roman reasoning, is in fact the mother of invention. During more affluent decades we were inclined to add rather than change, to buy quick solutions which accumulated like barnacles on the ship of state and caused even more of a drag on progress. Quickly-bought solutions are no longer so easily purchasable--and now the attention is

moving toward changes in basic ground rules rather than simply tinkering with bureaucratic programs.

Change in the pattern of educational finance is a case in point. We have long known the disparities in fiscal capacity among local school districts. A decade ago we were trying to cure them with the bandaids of compensatory spending. Today, presidents, governors and legislators--given public hostilities are pulling back even from that. But judges in state and federal courts have moved into the breach, and are invalidating the basic ground rules of local property tax financing and forcing systematic change. This is inventive in more than one respect. For the courts have recognized that the political process itself is at stymie, and are giving elected officials good reason to make otherwide unpopular and improbable moves. In New Jersey, a state court ruled when governor and legislature were immobilized; and I know that not only the governor but a large number of legislators were glad the court had taken the initiative and found a way of holding political feet to the fires of necessity: the legislature, in short, was given a year to find a constitutional alternative to local property tax financing of education.

When the legislature finally acts, the new aid formula will be a compromise of sorts. I don't think anyone should be surprised or pained if inventive response should not be as tidy as our more purist instincts would have it. Compromise is the gut stuff of politics, and politics are bound to be the arena where our genuine needs and dwindling resources confront each other.

Such a confrontation is now going on in Massachusetts, with the governor pressing for educational change and educators crying for larger budgets. In that arena, basic changes are forced into the open-changes that educators might not be able even to debate if left to themselves on campus: e.g., tenure; three vs. four years of college; lay vs. professional control.

That last question is basic, and financial necessity has played a critical part in making certain it's openly and seriously considered. I know and support Carl Pforzheimer's deep commitment to an expanding rule for laymen. For too long, education has been dominated by professionals and their technical concerns. In education, the Boards of education at local and state levels are having to reassert themselves not simply at the level which they have always worked but in major policy matters. They are joining in the difficult but necessary comparisons between apples and oranges: Is it better to spend more money on education or on health or on something else? They with other laymen, not least those in the state legislatures, are forcing education out of the old sanctuary of bring above politics and into politics. This is going to be rought, but it has to be.

It has to be because education is too important to be left only to the experts. Education is one of the services which has defied the logic and rigor of the manufacturing economy. In

manufacturing economy, through automation, has been able to limit labor costs. In the service economy this is more difficult, because services (ie. labor) are the product. The wage bill in service industries goes up in a radical cost curve particularly as bargaining becomes stronger. Public service unions, including teachers, are able to exact more from the economy than productivity alone might justify -- and more so, as "productivity" in the service economy becomes so difficult to define and measure.

If we are to break out of the escalating cost curves of the service sector -- and education particularly -- we will have to make some basic changes: genuine necessity should force us to be genuinely inventive.

Despite its being heralded as genuinely inventive, revenue sharing moves dangerously in the opposite direction -- toward an easy way out, a return to the supposedly discredited formula of the sixties, which is to paper over real problems with federal money, this time with no strings attached.

I remember when a major foundation decided in the fifties to come to the aid of American hospitals. $200 million was suddenly sent as Christmas gifts to every general hospital in the country. The checks arrived in Kansas City just when financial necessity had brought the hospitals in that area to the point of agreeing to federate and more other long-overdue changes. But when those checks arrived, agreement vanished, and it took another ten years of renewed financial crisis and negotiations to regain the willingness to reform.

New Jersey has just received its first check under revenue sharing. Governor Cahill -- stymied in his efforts to get legislative approval of his tax reform package -- distributed $40 million of those federal revenues to local school districts. He showed some creativity in doing that, but also took the heat off the legislature by contriving another escape from fundamental tax reform. $40 million spent on and through the status quo is simply going to confirm present practice.

A far more creative approach would have been to capitalize that $40 million and devote the annual return of $2.4 million (at 6 per cent) to a continuing research and development program for analyzing and improving educational systems and their performance. New Jersey, by that device, could have had its own "National Institute of Education" -- a permanent capacity to analyze, innovate and improve. And so could every other state involved in revenue sharing.

Another of the harsh realities I listed -- public and governmental impotence -- can also be looked at positively. Let me cite the role of the states. I know it is popular to talk about how ineffective the States have been, and I have seen State government

close enough to know all their faults. They are considerable. But the States now are where the action is. The ground rules of our society are written into state constitutions and state law. The police power inherent in and exercised by the states determine how we live, under what conditions, by what terms. Now all those ground rules and the process by which they have been set are coming into question. During the '60's we superimposed bureaucratic programs on top of the existing rules. Some of those programs -- like the poverty program and especially legal services -- called attention to the inequities and inadequacies of those ground rules. Now that those programs are being cut off, the courts and Ralph Nader and the growing tradition of advocacy are spreading the challenge and calling for basic change.

The challenge to property tax school financing is one case in point. Another is the challenge to the States' customary ways of professional licensing. There is a guildism in the business now that is disastrous. In New Jersey until very recently, laymen were not allowed on professional licensing boards; also, the citizen didn't know when the boards met or under what circumstances. The individual guilds and trades and professions ran the operation. The lawyers regulate the lawyers, the doctors the doctors, the teachers the teachers, the barbers the barbers, etc.

Our State governments too often have been parcelled out to special interests. But to see only the negative is to miss more than half of the reality and less of the promise.

Again, under pressure from the courts and the logic of survival, olf ground rules and procedures are changing. Enough to give heart (certainly the need gives reason) to renewed efforts to make State governments come alive. Central to those efforts are two things: enough citizen pressure on the State governments to force them to respond, and enough analytic capacity within State legislatures and departments to work through complex problems and respond with the sophistication that complexity demands. And not just staff. I've been urging my students to run for state elective office. And to engage directly in this tug of war.

Another harsh reality I talked about was the nascent anarchy of our times. That term seems distant to us who were raised on the debates of the last generation between freedom and authoritarianism. Now the issue is between freedom and anarchy -- can we retain any semblance of agreement and cede enough authority for government to act. But before we get stampeded by that fear into an authoritarian reaction, the apparent anarchy of our times can also be positively interpreted. Much of it is a healthy pluralism- a range of individual differences and permitted behaviors which may not accord with past notions but be the stuff of a far richer and sturdier democracy. Also a sophistication that any governmental effort to order behavior at the scale of complexity and diversity we have reached would be exercises in futility.

We need a new ethic -- and new consensus -- to live safely with such a diversity and make the most of it. It's in the positive direction of building that ethic that we ought to be moving -- and despite many discouraging evidences to the contrary, I think we are . The real danger is that we act in the negative -- that fearing diversity, we attempt to shrink others and ourselves back into the older forms of order and conventionality.

It is in that positive spirit, for example, that I would hope we might tackle the problem of security and order in the schools. Security is a very real problem. An exaggerated and authoritarian response to it could -- and in some cases has -- become an even greater problem.

one could hope for an equally sane response to the gathering call for "career education." That too easily could be a forced march backward and into a blind alley. It will be that if we tract the socially-different into dead occupations, or make the mistake of simply producing more courses when society doesn't produce more jobs. But career education can be handled positively -- again as an enlightened response to human diversity. We are coming into a period where we need new varieties of vocations for different people -- "different storkes for different folks." Most of these new jobs -- and the most satisfying ones -- will be found in the service sector -- and in "careers" that in many cases have still to be defined and worked out. Much of the education for these new careers will have to be self-organized, with help coming from advisers rather than pedagogs, and only part of it in a former classroom. And with the student taking initiative, much of the guild responses and costliness of conventional education might be offset.

I had also referred to the harshening mood of our times."I've got mine, now you get yours." It is hard to fight this. It is hard to fight it, because all of us in a society of lessening social ties are trapped into a survival pattern of taking care of number one. We don't look anymore for as much help as we once did from our community, from our parents, from our neighborhood. It can be a lonely life in a lonely crowd.

Without turning romantic, we can help soften this invitation to cynical self-interest. I could suggest several things. One is to develop a capacity to build communities rather than simply housing developments. The extended family as a continuing set of blood relationships may be gone. But what it represented --a set of social aids and reinforcements-- can be encouraged by a development process that is sensitive to social needs, and provides the full range of services that make for a more genuine sense of community. The time is critical: we are on the verge of another massive round of household formation, with the age group 25-34 burgeoning in numbers throughthe seventies. Their life styles and outlook not only are reflected but also determined by the form and quality of their built environment.

In thuilding these new American communities, child care and development will be major concerns. So will formal schooling. More and more, we are learning how closely bound up the performance of schooling is with the quality of family and community life. If we are really to think positively, we would seize on this next round of America's growth, and turn those imminent quantities into a culture of real quality. We educators should have a special knack for bringing the best out.

Address Delivered By
Gregory R. Anrig
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 16, 1972

Crucial Issues in Education and the Spirit of American Education

The program for your 1972 Annual Convention notes that this general session will focus on a discussion of the new NASBE booklet containing six papers developed under a Title V ESEA project. These papers deal with issues of governance and of curricula which are crucial to education and to members of state boards of education.

Let me first briefly review these papers as a way of reminding you of their contents, offer some personal observations on them and, finally, suggest a seventh issue which affects the climate of American education today and therefore influences how these issues can be resolved. Then let us enter into a discussion which hopefully will be both vigorous and enlightening.

"Alternatives for Educational Governance at State Levels." D. Gene Watson

In terms of the perspective I bring to this task, I found this topic to be the kind of issue NASBE should be considering and encouraging others to consider. The paper provoked me to look again at my feelings about political acuity vs. political immersion for educational boards. Precisely because I differ with some of the views in the paper, it effectively serves the purpose of a discussion paper.

The basic point on which I differ with the paper is its assertation that "The partisan nature of the executive and legislative branches demands the awareness and capability for utilization of party influence. Partisan participation not antipathy seems to be a requirement for effective government." (p. 51) I have experienced the effects of this in Washington and am convinced that what one gains from administering education programs in a partisan structure does not offset what one can lose. The U.S. Office of Education, after all, is administered within such a partisan structure but no one I am aware of describes its effectiveness as very worthy of emulation.

I do believe, however, that those who govern education must have political acuity -- a keen appreciation for political action and skills in the political process. This certainly

leads to the involvement of politicians but not necessarily to their direct membership on a state board of education. I would encourage including representatives of the governor's office and legislature on state board study groups and ad hoc panels with a specific task and a limited tenure, and I would include representatives of professional, business, and citizen groups as well. But not as statutory members of the state board of education as advocated by Mr. Watson (p. 53).

In the mid-1960's Massachusetts initiated a study of the structure of education in the Commonwealth. Co-Chairman of this blue ribbon study group was Kevin Harrington, now Senate President in the Legislature. This was an astute appointment of an outstanding legislator. He accepted the responsibility not only because of his commitment to improving education but because of the task being something he could do in a set period of time in addition to his other duties. Significant parts of the Willis-Harrington Report, under his guidance, became law and have been a constructive influence on public education in Massachusetts. Other states similarly have found ways to significantly involve able politicians and gain their support without turning the state board of education into a partisan body.

The paper has a bluntness about it. It states, "Indeed, it is possible to conceptualize the operation of education in some states without a state education agency." (p. 52) Too strong? Not long ago, a nearby state education agency with a staff of more than 200 (and a rather good reputation) was the brunt of a study which claimed it could do all its present tasks with a staff of 30! Althought too sweeping an indictment, the paper and I agree that the role of a state education agency must be broadened in the direction of leadership and coordination (or the "managerial linkage function.") We also agree on the idea of some regional agency to increase accessibility to assistance resources and on consideration of more use of temporary and consultant personnel in a state education agency as a way of better drawing upon professional talent from throughout the state.

"The State Education Agency at Work," Kenneth H. Hansen

This paper addresses an important topic for NASBE. It is less controversial than the Watson paper but, especially in its second half, makes some important points which may stimulate the thinking of NASBE members.

Perhaps because I believe in any organization having goals and priorities -- but goals and priorities specific enough to govern actions -- the first part of the paper seemed too pedantic. Many states, including my own, have been going through a process of goal setting such as is suggested in the

paper. I served as a consultant to the Massachusetts effort. In the course of this process, we analyzed the goals statements of at least a dozen states and found that, with differences of wording and format, they each shared in common approximately eight goals which, in turn, coincided generally with the cardinal principles which the NEA's old Educational Policies Commission issued in the late 1930's.

Given the present problems of education, I question how useful such general goals will be. I suspect they will suffer the same fate as the plethora of curriculum guides in the 1950's -- attractive documents that were shelved and unused. These goals statements I have seen tend to be too universal, too all-inclusive, and therefore, too overwhelming for any individual or group of individuals no matter how well-intentioned. Rather, I would advocate more attention to intermediate operational goals at the state level, limited in number rather than all-inclusive, and specific enough so that a realistic (in terms of fiscal and personnel resources) one-year plan can be developed around them.

The paper states "Participation in the formulation of district designed and district oriented activities in some of the areas mentioned below (*) may well be the chief work of the contemporary state education agency." (p. 37) I agree with the general premise that state education agencies increasingly should become involved in helping school districts accomplish what they feel is important (provided, of course, that what is being tried is consistent with state policy.) It seems to me that the role of state agencies (including state universities) is to build and support capacities in individuals and in systems which more effectively draw upon local, regional and state resources for desirable ends. This changes the state agency role from that of a regulator towards that of a consultant and broker of services. Lasting educational change, I believe, is more likely to come about when you are helping people accomplish something they feel is significant in a manner which they respect rather than when they feel something is being imposed upon them.

In recommending that state education agencies improve their services to school districts, the paper also recommends that the agencies set about their own self-improvement. I particularly was impressed by the author's questioning of research and development work within state education agencies which is not directly related to specific services (p. 38), and by his advocacy of more flexible patterns of staff organization and training (p. 39).

Finally, given my reactions to the Watson paper, I couldn't help but agree with this paper's position regarding inter-agency

cooperation that "Aloofness from partisan politics is highly desirable, but aloofness from the political system is impossible." (p. 40)

"Full State Funding of Education," Richard A. Rossmiller

This paper deals with an extremely complex and technical subject in rather understandable terms and format. It is an informative document which should help NASBE members better understand some of the complexities of alternative state aid formulas and their effects upon different kinds of school districts. Since the general topic of Full State Funding will be the subject of tomorrow's general session (with a panel which includes Professor Rossmiller), I will take the liberty of not dwelling further on this particular paper in this presentation.

"Teacher Centers and Teacher Renewal," James F. Collins

I believe that one function of the state role in education should be to coordinate resources for the in-service education of school personnel. Therefore, I see the topic of this paper as an appropriate one for NASBE consideration.

It is difficult for me to be objective about this paper because I totally agree with its central thesis that in-service education must involve those being trained in planning the training experience, and must address much more directly the problems facing school personnel in specific settings. Indeed, this is the thesis of the Institute for Learning and Teaching at the University of Massachusetts/Boston where we are attempting to provide the kind of training support described in this paper to those who staff difficult urban schools.

I heartily endorse the paper's support for the concept of a Teacher Center as a collaborative school district-university undertaking. Given the considerable investment states already have made in public teacher training institutions and the availability of private institutions as well, it would be an unwise allocation of limited funds to establish separate and competitive "centers" in each school district or group of districts. True, the paper's central thesis calls for these schools of education in institutions of higher education to break away from past habits and become much more directly involved with those they train and the problems trainees actually face in their schools. But the dwindling job market for new teachers and the growing dissatisfaction with existing graduate programs in education increasingly will be forcing schools of education to change or perish. This paper proposes

an alternative, which, with state support and leadership, offers an important and needed role which our experience at the University of Massachusetts/Boston indicates is both possible and exciting.

"Care and Education of the Young Child," Richard T. Salzer
"Career Education," Bill Wesley Brown

Both these papers address issues of curricula which are current. Early childhoold education and Career Education have strong endorsement of national leaders (although, I can't help but add, the vitality of the endorsements has been greater up to now than the vitality of the appropriations to carry them out.) I personally believe that the papers deal with two directions in education which are greatly needed. But I would caution against the syndrome of the 1960's. New programs do not guarantee improved educational opportunities. We need to better understand the effects of these initiatives, especially the effects of early childhood education programs on the web of family life, before marching to Pretoria. We also need to treasure more the instructional time of our elementary schools where new programs such as Career Education may simply be added rather than integrated with an even further decrease in time for basic skills which, after all, are fundamental to career opportunities.

These then are the six issue papers from the NASBE booklet and my comments on them. In preparing for this convention, however, I thought about all else that faces you as members of state boards of education. In the course of that thinking, an additional issue was clear to me that cuts across all the others, and that is the issue of the Spirit of Education.

All problems cannot be resolved with new money, new organization, or new programs. We also need a new spirit. Those who work in the field of education increasingly seem to feel overwhelmed. Those who are patrons of education -- the taxpayers of the country -- increasingly lack confidence in schools.

We seem to have lost direction. For the two decades following World War II, there was general agreement about what the schools had to do. Millions of children were being born and we had to provide for them. This meant more classrooms and more teachers, quantitative goals justified by unchallengeable statistics. Certainly there also was concern over quality during this period. Admiral Rickover, Sputnik and Mr. Conant stimulated vigorous debate and examination. But this concern tended to deal with quality in quantitative terms -- more mathematics, more phonics, more foreign languages, more guidance counselors.

This quantitative spirit was easy to rally to and easy to understand. Our post-World War II society was not one to deprive children whose parents had been children in the Depression. And we had faith in this spirit. The results were clear. New buildings were dazzling and a source of community pride. Double sessions were ended or avoided; class size was at or below an accepted optimum; more teachers had more degrees; more classrooms had projectors and television sets and science equipment and learning games.

This quantitative spirit carried us into the sixties when the Nation's conscience began to react to inequities confronting the poor and minority groups of our land. The war on poverty and the battle for justice adopted the quantitative spirit and the landmark education legislation of the 1960's was sculptured by it in the Congress of the United States. And here the roots of disillusionment began.

We learned that the quantitative spirit can produce classrooms and equipment but not greater achievement or educational opportunity. Try as each of us in education has, we have not been able to overcome the effects of social deprivation and inequalities by more of the same in the classroom.

And we have all anguished over this fact. People do not accept responsible positions in public service, as all of you here have, without a desire to help others. Nor do many people become teachers and educational administrators who are not committed to helping children. But in spite of these honorable motivations and unprecedented legislation and appropriations, we have not been able to overcome in school the effects of fundamental weaknesses in society.

The evidence of disillusionment is more than prevalent. If you work closely with urban teachers, as I do, you are struck by their pervading feeling of helplessness. The turnover in superintendencies makes for rapid seniority, as I am sure all of us can recount from our respective states. And for the first time, more school bond issues are being defeated by voters than are being passed.

The national faith and confidence which characterized the quantitative spirit have been replaced by skepticism and retrenchment. And this shift has respectable intellectual support. The Coleman Report, the restudy of that Report recently published by Daniel P. Moynihan and Frederick Mosteller.[1] and now

1 Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, On Equality of Educational Opportunity, (Random House, New York, 1972).

Christopher Jencks' new book[2] all document in troubling but scholarly detail that more of all those things which we assumed would make a difference in learning results does not make a significant difference.

In typical American fashion, we are in a period of trying to blame someone for this. At the same time we defensively challenge the motivation and methodology of those who dare speak the unspeakable.

Fixing blame is unproductive and impossible. As a society, we are learning something about mass public education. One cannot fairly be blamed for acting with good intentions on the basis of what honestly was believed to be true. And we did believe in the quantitative spirit.

But indeed we do deserve blame if, having learned something about public education, we strive to preserve myths and false aspirations. The challenge is to find a realistic direction for education which will rebuild confidence in and within our schools.

The finding of a new spirit in education requires a new look at the purposes of mass public education. We have learned in the sixties that the schools alone cannot reconstruct society, indeed they can do precious little in this area. What then of the earlier mission of the schools in the "Old American Dream"--upward mobility, cultural assimilation, nationalistic patriotism, economic self-sufficiency, Horatio Alger perseverance, respect for authority? It seems to me that much of what we call the Generation Gap of today involves a widespread rejection of these commitments which many adults still look back on with some warm nostalgia.

If not social reconstruction or the Old American Dream, then what? What really is to be the purpose of mass public education in the last part of this century? My answer would include improving the quality of life and strengthening responsible individualism -- a qualitative spirit to replace that of the past -- but that answer is important only to me at this time. The important thing is that those concerned with education, especially those in responsible positions such as you hold, begin seeking their own answers and encouraging others to do so as well so that out of what follows can come a new direction for American education, not necessarily changed drastically but at least redefined in terms of the present state of society and the present state of knowledge about what is possible. In this way we hopefully can find a path out of the disillusionment of our times and a new Spirit of Education for the future.

---

2 Christopher Jencks et al, Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America (Basic Books, New York, 1972).

Address Delivered By
William G. Saltonstall
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 17, 1972

I would like to take this occasion to thank all of you native Iowans who put on that show (Iowa Night), it was just a terrific evening. The major part of it was the snake dance, or the conga line, or whatever that Carol and Carl Pforzheimer got started toward the end. That inevitably reminded me of how Carl used to snap the whip about 48 years ago when he and I were in this little cow-college (Harvard) and it was a cow-college years back. I was a big 180 pound oarsman and Carl, of course, was the director of the boat and as cockswain he had this long whip. Ever since, I have been used to doing just whatever Carl told me, so when he called up last Spring, I was pleased to be invited out here.

The Massachusetts State Board of Education on which I did have the honor of serving is a lay board, like most of our state boards are. It was amusing to me that when I accepted a job at Harvard University, and part of the deal, Elliot Richardson, then Attorney General of the Commonwealth in Massachusetts had to officially state that Harvard University was an educational institution, and, therefore, I could no onger serve on the State Board of Education.

I would like to just talk a little bit about the work of the President's Commission on School Finance and its major recommendation. I was sitting in my little cubby-hole in the Spring of 1970. The telephone rang one day and my Secretary (I had one then) said it was long distance. I grabbed the receiver (I should say to begin with that at that time I was Trustee of the state university which was going through the disagreeable business of unloading its president). The voice said, "I am calling for the President." The only President on my mind at that time was the president of the state university with whom we were having a fair amount of trouble. So I hesitated a moment on the telephone and finally I said, "What President", whereupon he drew himself up and let me know in no uncertain terms what post he was calling from. He asked me to serve on the President's Commission on School Finance and said I had 30 minutes to decide whether I would or not. If I didn't decide in 30 minutes, that was it. I said I wouldn't tell him right then. I wanted to keep him on the hook but wanted to check with my three bosses,my lady friend (wife), the Superintendent of Schools where I was going to be teaching the next fall, and the Dean of the School of Education. I fortunately was able to check with all three in 30 minutes, called him back and sealed the deal.

This commission attempts to give reports. Here I have the booklet called "Schools, People, and Money." If I had been more thoughtful beforehand, I suppose I would have had the government printing office send a number of copies here. I don't know how many of you have seen it, but I can let you know where to order it if you wish to receive copies.

The commission included 16 people who met over a period of two years, including a meeting last April as near as I remember it, chaired by Neil MacElroy, Chairman of Proctor and Gamble, and a very, very up-to-date, wide-awake layman as far as education is concerned. The men from the Commission are from all over, with all kinds of backgrounds. The staff was not very large at first, but to grow rapidly as time went on and as funds became sufficient. Somewhere in the neighborhood of two million dollars of taxpayers money was used for research. This was contracted out to quite a large number of universities and groups who were felt to have insight into some of the problems we were studying. The commission met at least monthly for a couple of years. There was also appointed by the president at the same time, a so-called panel on non-public education or non-public schools of which I was also a member. That group put out a separate report which I don't happen to have with me.

We had two meetings with the president, and the first of those was rather early and the president was very well briefed, I thought. He spent about an hour and a half with us in the cabinet room not merely talking to us. We talked to him in a question and answer discussion session. It was very good, I thought, and no punches were pulled. We had a second session with him later on which happened to come just three days after his return from China. Again he was well briefed but he was awfully tired.

I supposed like every document of this sort that we turn out, in the late 20th century, we start out by trying to define equality of opportunity and quality education we went very rapidly toward the consideration of full state funding. We started meeting before the Serrano decision. That came about a third or half of the way through our study and seemed to give some support or direction to what we were doing. But we spent much of time in having the report really show what we were trying to define by these two terms. Having done so, we then set about recommending that the way to come closest to accomplishing the two basic objectives we had defined should say perhaps that although we were called the President's Commission on School Finance, we were really from the very first concerned with education as a whole and not just the financing of education.

Rightly or wrongly, that is the way the commission worked. From the first we moved in the direction of full state funding, which I suppose by definition we meant to be funding other than

federal or local funding for the elementary and secondary schools of the country. We had many debates among ourselves as between those who felt the inevitable loss of local controls of the schools if we went to state funding. But it seemed to us that the over-riding necessity to get further toward equality of opportunity and further toward real quality schools required that we move in the direction of full state funding of schools. By that, of course, we meant state handling of property tax, sales tax, incorporation tax,and income tax, etc.

It did seem to us on the commission and still seems to me that we are in a period now when the legislators are very important. It also seems the courts are becoming very important as far as determining what is going to go on in financing schools. The courts seem to be forcing legislation. I don't know if this is a good or bad thing.

We had a good discussion on the degree to which there was any correlation between expenditures and the quality of edutation. I think I can say really that the assumption, rightly or wrongly, of the commission was that while there was no precise measurable correlation there was nevertheless a very high assumed correlation on the face of it. I don't know personally whether we were right or wrong in our assumption.

One thing that was a little new and different perhaps from some of the other proposals for state funding was the substantial incentive grant that the commission proposed in order to bring about, over a four or five year period, the kind of cooperation that would be required by the states. Without going into detail, I can say that this grant provided for between four and five billion dollars worth of aid to schools. Plans for moving in the direction of full state funding had been approved by federal authorities. We did have problems, there were a good many of us on the commission who felt we had fallen short of the primary objective in that we were only talking about equality of education within given state boundaries, not nationwide. There was some move, toward the end of our meetings to really push hard for legislation and funding that would move us further in the direction of a national equalization process. That was not the recommendation of the commission. It was the recommendation perhaps of a minority - of some six or seven members out of the 16 members.

If you have the wherewithall to do some real experimenting and make some tremendous improvements, something that has not been done before, why not allow substantially more, even unlimited local addition. I think I know the arguments on both sides, but I was torn myself on that issue. We all fear

that presidential commissions tend to be "a dime a dozen." They cost a lot of money but we don't seem to worry too much about that. I was very concerned toward the end of our deliberations that we were making a report that goes to the president. He had already met with us twice and indicated his interests and spoken quite strongly on the need to do something about the local property tax. I suggested at one of our meetings that we not cease meeting after the report to the President and to the Congress (this report was to both the President and the Congress.) We needed, I felt, to see whether it had made any difference; whether anything had been done about it. Apparently, I was speaking alone because no meetings of the commission have been held since the report was sent to the White House and to the Congress.

I imagine it is true with most of you as it is with me, that education is sort of a mystery. For nearly 50 years, one way or the other in the teaching or administrative end of schools, it still seems a mystery to me. I have been in private schools and public schools, peace corps, job corps, a highly structured school, a low structure school with as much chaos as I can possibly imagine and became fascinated by it and interested in it. I have a strong reaction to the business of how we measure education by dollars, both in the in-put and the out-put areas. I really feel strongly, especially at the out-put end that we make an awful mistake where we go overboard with income criteria. We shouldn't look for opportunities to deplore the emphasis of such things as life income as a result of 8th grade, 12th grade, college, etc. Education, I think, is really to help a person toward the capacity for a generous enjoyment of life, it certainly seems we should get out of the habit of measuring it only by money. We should measure it more somehow in those wonderful intangibles, living and learning and loving.

I'd like to conclude with a story from the state of Maine, and I know there are some maniacs in the room to whom I apologize. On the weekend of the first moon landing, I was in Blueharbor, Maine, and the climax of that weekend was to be a lobster bake down on the beach. My friend asked me if I wanted to take part in that, and if I wanted to go over to get the food. So we went over to Seth Hodgings place. Seth was about 82 years old, he was doen on the beach in his rubber boots talking to a friend and he paid us no mind at all. My friend finally got a little impatient and tapped him on the arm and said, "Seth do you want to get us some lobster?" Seth said, "Sure" and started to get into his row-boat and went out with a raft and got the fish and brought them in and while he was slipping them into this dirty, wet brown paper bag, my friend said, "Seth are you going to watch the moon landing

tonight?" He looked down toward his feet, and spat on his rubber boots and thought for a while and said, "O God, I can't see that far." Well I feel a little that way on the state funding of education.

Address Delivered By
William R. MacDougall
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 17, 1972

Educational Finance

Cicero said, "Not to know what happened before you were born, that is to be a child always." In some quarters, there is a belief that the school finance question was born with Serrano in August 1971. I would like to take you back several years before Serrano. This should help put the subject of school finance in its proper perspective.

Through the 1950's and 1960's we had become conditioned to rising school costs--the right response to heavier school enrollments and the need to improve the quality and quantity of public education. For example, State-local expenditures for local schools doubled in the decade of the 1960's and annual rate of growth well in excess of seven percent. Continuation of this rate of expansion in school budgets presented a fearful prospect for elected officials at the State and local level. State and local revenue systems had not been designed to cope at the same time with this growth in school spending and the demands for expansion in other functional areas.

Redressing Imbalances

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, most of whose members feel the tides of political fortune at first hand, became increasingly aware that school finance was a major factor contributing to the need to raise more State and local revenue. The Commission cited this need in 1965 in its report on Federal-State Personal Income Tax Coordination. The report noted, on page 3, "The overriding fiscal need of State governments (including their local governments) is more tax revenue, particularly a tax source with a strong-revenue growth potential in a growing economy." The Commission remarked that heavy Federal use of personal income tax had deterred State use of this prime revenue source. It therefore recommended a partial credit for State income tax payments against the Federal tax to encourage States to make more use of the personal income tax. (Not every Commission recommendation is immediately enacted into law.)

Two years later, the Commission suggested another technique for brining about a better balance between revenue needs and

program responsibilities. The Commission recommended restructuring the Federal aid system to provide (a) categorical grants for demonstration purposes, (b) functional block grants in program areas of broad national interest, and (c) revenue sharing or general support grants that States and localities could use for their own unique problems and priorities. (Some Commission recommendations are enacted ultimately.)

In 1969, the Commission probed the fiscal facts of life yet more deeply in its report State Aid to Local Government and discovered that the State and local sector confronted tough financial sledding largely due to the misassignment of financial responsibility for two major functions--welfare and education. The Commission recommended immediate Federal assumption of all welfare costs including medicaid and State assumption of all school costs as a prime long-run State fiscal policy objective. The Commission's recommendation for full state funding, as it has come to be called, stemmed from concern about the property tax burden and particularly the school's portion, which had risen from about one-third of all property tax collections in the 1940's to about one-half of property tax collections in 1972. Commission members shared the feeling that the property tax should not be asked to support both schools and other municipal functions.

Commission members were aware of the impending challenges to State school aid laws. They hoped that, by shifting financial responsibility to the State, reasonable and equitable formulas could be developed to mitigate the intrastate disparities in per pupil spending that result from the wide variations in local taxable wealth. ACIR's position on State funding was, however, directed at redressing a present fiscal imbalance, rather than responding to a Serrano-type challenge.

The Commission was careful not to minimize the difficulties that would be encountered in enacting the full State funding recommendation. It suggested that local control was a value to be cherished. To preserve an area for local fiscal discretion, ACIR suggested a limited local add-on not to exceed 10 percent of the State supported program.

The Commission recognized that money was the big stumbling block to State assumption of school costs and suggested that the transition could be greatly eased by Federal assumption of welfare costs, with the freed-up State funds devoted to public school support. The Commission in 1969 did not contemplate that these shifts of financial responsibility would be the occasion for massive local property tax relief although the members

probably felt fairly certain that in the short-run some property tax relief would be forthcoming.

Undergirding the three Commission studies I have mentioned was the idea of strengthening the fiscal power of the States and thereby their political power. The Commission has generally sought to lean into the wind; in this case, into the National Government with its powerful revenue generating capacity that seemed to be making Washington the center of all power.

In relating this history of the development of the Commission's position on full State funding, I have omitted mention of the people who, either through their writing or by virtue of serving as critics and counsellors, helped ACIR to arrive at its policy posture. For example, Dr. James B. Conant revived the State funding idea from more than a quarter century of somnolence. James Allen then took up the cudgels for State funding until his untimely death.

In his 1972 State of the Union Message, the President expressed his intention to request ACIR to evaluate a plan that would call for school finance reform and residential school property tax relief by replacement with a Federal value added tax. Since February of this year, four or more members of our staff, along with outside consultants, have been preparing draft reports for Commission consideration in replying to the President. Draft reports on the school finance and property tax aspects have been studied by ACIR members and the Federal value-added tax draft is now in active preparation. The Commission has set mid-December as the date of its meeting to formulate a reply to the President.

The Commission's consideration of the school finance topic is not as all encompassing as either the NEFP study or the study by the President's Commission. Our study focuses on the intrastate school finance disparities question; that is, whether and to what extent additional Federal assistance is needed for public education in order to meet problems of school finance which may stem from recent court decisions. ACIR will recommend whether the Federal contribution to public schools should be larger or smaller than it now is only with respect to the resolution of the intrastate disparities question. Our concern is the Federal role, if any, in resolving the issue of intrastate school finance disparities. We will not be dealing with other hot school finance issues such as aid to private schools, or interstate school finance disparities.

Current Events

This brings us to the Serrano era--more or less the present. Steve Browning can and will fill us in on the legalities of

Serrano so I won't dwell on the case itself. What interests most of us are the implications of Serrano fiscally and educationally speaking. Much of what can be said in this connection is speculative, and from your viewpoint, I think this is encouraging because it gives you and other educationally oriented groups a great opportunity to shape public policy in this vital area.

Two major studies in school finance were well on toward completion when the Serrano era dawned. The National Educational Finance Project and the President's Commission on School Finance covered virtually all aspects of school finance including the role of the various governmental levels. The conclusions of these two studies are somewhat at odds with regard to the Federal role in school support. On other matters, the studies reach many of the same policy positions. Dick Rossmiller will describe NEFP's position on the Federal role in detail but my understanding is that the NEFP recommends that Uncle Sam provide not less than 22 percent of school costs and preferably about 30 percent. The President's Commission was much more bearish, visualizing a temporary Federal grant to encourage State assumption but no long-range Federal general support for education at least for the present.

Before sharing some of our initial findings and policy concerns with you, I want to note that State officials have been very active in the school finance area. The National Legislative Conference convened a Special Committee on School Finance headed by Senator Laverne of New York. The report of the Special Committee begins by noting areas of agreement on basic issues among committee members. The first of these is most encouraging. The legislators agreed that States could assume responsibility for seeing that elementary and secondary schools are funded properly and that the "equal opportunity" responsibility enunciated in Serrano be accepted, regardless of the eventual outcome in the courts, because the Serrano principle is right. The National Governors Conference is on record in much the same vein. State officials apparently recognize that their action holds the key to the resolution of the Serrano-type school finance controversy.

ACIR Findings and Policy Concerns

In the course of preparing its report on the implications of the Serrano principle for state school finance systems the staff has discovered that:

1. Court cases on school finance have not foreclosed States from enacting their own responses to the "nowealth" mandate.

2. Not only do States have wide discretion in school matters, fiscally speaking and relative to each other, they have fiscal elbowroom--except perhaps, New York, Vermont, Wisconsin and Hawaii. (Hawaii has no school finance or property tax problem). Indeed, States reportedly are experiencing increasing fiscal ease while the Federal government confronts mounting fiscal pressure.

3. Fiscally speaking, again, most States could manage the estimated cost of leveling-up per pupil expenditures in poor districts to comply with the "no-wealth" philosophy.

4. Translating untapped fiscal capacity into affirmative State action, however, constitutes a formidable political undertaking. A Federal incentive grant is one possible way to induce State fiscal action to reduce intrastate disparities.

5. The contending policy alternatives open to the national government would seem to be:

   a. Maintain the present policy of neutrality toward State school financing arrangements--let the States do it.

   b. Adopt a temporary and limited assistance policy to help States get going on their own to eliminate disparities--proposed by the President's Commission on School Finance.

   c. Adopt a permanent multipurpose Federal aid to education program one purpose of which would be to eliminate intrastate disparities--the educator's approach.

Speaking candidly, it now appears that intrastate disparities in school finance stand out as one problem of federalism that will tend to abate with time rather than worsen. The delaying forces are the public antipathy to increased taxes and the alleged threat of centralized financing to local control. The forces spurring reform are the State tradition for improving the equalizing character of the State aid system, taxpayer pressure to slow the rise in property tax levies,

Federal fiscal actions such as revenue sharing and finally, more State court decisions. A major consideration for making a final policy selection is whether the President and Congress want to speed up the school finance reform process.

In the property tax field, the staff study has indicated the following findings and policy considerations:

1. An ACIR poll shows the property tax as very unpopular compared to State income and sales taxes.

2. Households of the elderly and other low income groups are particularly hard hit by the property tax. Fifteen States have working programs of property tax relief for this group.

3. Economic theory on the property tax is undergoing revision--the new theory suggests that the property tax may more appropriately be considered a tax on capital rather than on consumption and thus renters may not be bearing the tax!

4. The property tax is used unevenly by the various States. School property tax reduction would produce uneven benefits. Reduction in school property tax threatens to be offset by increases in expenditures of other local governments. States that have tried reduction have had to put severe constraints on local decision-making to assure tax relief.

5. Assessment reform, if achieved, holds little promise of property tax relief.

6. The Federal government, through the income tax, now provides partial property tax relief for homeowners, but the relief passes undetected over the head of low and lower middle income households while helping higher income households.

The contending policy paths open to the National Government with respect to property tax relief and reform would seem to be:

1. The National Government could maintain its present "hands-off" posture.

2. Federal grants could be developed to assist State reform and restructuring of the property tax.

3. A major Federal property tax relief effort could be developed to focus on either the local or State government level or on the National Government level through aid to education.

4. The Federal government could adopt a new method of coordinating Federal, State and local tax burdens with a view to making the coordination visible to taxpayers at all income levels.

The challenge confronting all of us in the days, weeks, and months ahead is to develop a satisfactory response to justifiable arguments for improving the equity of our tax and school finance systems. Perhaps we can all agree with the District Court of Johnson County, Kansas, when it said:

"One must recognize that 'equality' as an absolute standard in every facet, sub-part, and discernible category is not susceptible of determination and is not a judicially manageable concept." An article in March, 1972 FORTUNE magazine, authored by Max Ways is titled "EQUALITY: A STEP AND ENDLESS STAIR", and has as its thesis the proposition that current drives for equality in everything will be harder to satisfy than the old American pursuit of "more".

The right to equal protection of law is not tantamount to a regimented homogeneity. Equality does not exclude variety. The equality conflicts concerning schools now extend beyond racial issues while presenting moral as well as practical problems. Although courts may not act to appease the envy of those enjoying power and control, the courts must think in terms of reduction of unequal treatment by government.

The quest for equality will strain our society with legal problems fraught with economic and political difficulties. However, it is a relatively simple duty to develop a financing scheme that is fiscally neutral and does not make public education a function of wealth other than the wealth of the state as a whole.

Address Delivered By
Dr. Richard A. Rossmiller
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 17, 1972

The Politics of School Fiscal Reform

I am somewhat at a loss for words this morning, since I discussed full state funding at some length at each of your area meetings last spring. I look around the room and see many familiar faces so I know that many of you have had a previous opportunity to query me on this topic. Based on the comments by Dr. Anrig, yesterday, I suppose those of you who were able to comprehend my paper in less than three readings should be classified as rapid learners. Those of you who required more than three readings shouldn't feel bad, because school finance is a deceptively complex subject. It touches nearly everything that is done in the schools and, like all other aspects of public finance, it involves problems of equity with regard to both obtaining the needed revenue and distributing that revenue. As you work at problems of school finance you find they are much less simple than they appear at first glance. In working with members of Citizens' Committees, I have observed repeatedly that what appear to them to be very simple problems at the outset of their work are found about six months later to be much more complex. As they work at problems, members begin to see how changes in one area affect other areas, and that the long run effects may be far from what was intended.

I don't want to discuss the National Educational Finance Project at any length for several reasons. First, we held a series of meetings to report the results of the NEFP and I know that many of you attended one or more of those meetings. We have also presented the NEFP story in many of the states. That was a full day session and I have only a few minutes this morning I would emphasize that the National Educational Finance Project did not attempt to provide a single answer to the problems of school finance. We have 50 state school systems and 50 different school finance programs. It would be extremely unfortunate if the Serrano-type cases result in any ruling that would, in any way, weaken the responsibility of the states for the maintenance of public school systems. The major purposes of the National Educational Finance Project were to develop a base of data and to provide ways for people to study alternatives and arrive at that solution which is best for each particular state.

The courts have shown little inclination at this point to order specific solutions to the problems of educational finance. Rather, they have tossed the ball back to the legislative and executive branches, and they have given no precise directions as to what specific school finance plans would be acceptable. They have simply said that the existing school finance plan violates

the constitutional guarantees of due process and/or equal protection.

It appears that solutions to school finance problems must come through the democratic political process. The present "mess" in school finance is not the result of not knowing how to solve the problems of financing schools; it has resulted from the inability of those of us interested in school finance to use the political process to produce greater equality in educational opportunities for boys and girls in the various states. Perhaps we have not learned to work within the political process but perhaps that is not the entire answer. Discussions concerning school finance are seldom characterized by "enlightened self-interest"; t ley are much more likely to be characterized by the selfish individualism that Dean Ylvisaker referred to yesterday. Too many people think it is fine for other children to have equality of educational opportunity so long as it isn't quite as good as the opportunities available to their own children. This fact of life permeates all of the deliberations that go on in the various states concerning educational opportunities and the appropriate methods for financing education.

One contribution I might make to the session this morning is to discuss briefly the politics of school fiscal reform. As members of State Boards of Education, you undoubtedly will have substantial input into this political process as decisions are made. One concern that is particularly vivid to me, being from the mid-west and working in a state that has a long history of concern for local control, is the matter of local control ideology. This is a value position and cannot be changed by any amount of evidence. It can only be changed by changing values through argument and persuasion. The court in the Serrano case indicated that local control doesn't mean very much if you don't have the money needed to make it effective. But try and tell that to the residents of some of the least wealthy school districts in Wisconsin! Money isn't nearly as important to them as the semblance of local control. And the fascinating thing is they really have very little local control; they only think they do. But it is their perception that is important! So in a state with a system of many school districts with a substantial amount of school funds coming from local sources you are likely to encounter strong resistance to anything that even appears to get away from some local financial contribution and local control over decisions about educational programs. There is no point in pretending that this feeling does not exist and it must be dealt with within the political process. Local control ideology can "Shanghai" the most enlightened school finance program that one could imagine.

A related political fact of life is the existing system of school district organization. In Wisconsin we have gone through a period of school district reorganization over the past 25 years which has reduced the number of school districts from nearly

8,000 to about 450. Although further reorganization is needed, the progress made has been accomplished only with great effort and great anguish. School district reorganization is closely tied to local control ideology. One way to provide equality of fiscal resources in school districts within a state is to arrange their boundaries so that all districts would have the same amount of taxable resources. But all of you recognize this is not feasible. It would involve incredible gerrymandering, among other things, and it would not be possible politically. However, in many states some school district reorganization can and must be an integral part of any fiscal reform that aims to narrow the disparities in the amount of revenue available from one school district to another.

A third major concern of politicians in all states, but particularly in those where a large amount of local tax funds is being devoted to education, is that of property tax relief. Wisconsin, as many of you know, is one of the highest taxed states in the United States. The existing tax structure is an important factor and possible trade-offs--for example, the possibility of increasing income taxes in order to provide property tax relief--must be considered. When the members of the Governor's Task Force On Educational Finance and Property Tax Reform learned that to do away with local property taxes would require doubling the present state sales tax and the present state income tax, it was immediately evident to all of the members that such an approach was out of the question. It would be completely unrealistic to expect the Governor or Legislature to double the present income and sales tax rates, even if they could do away with property taxes. Yet property relief is a prime concern of state legislators. There will be no fiscal reform for education in Wisconsin unless a guarantee of substantial property tax relief is a part of it.

The concern for property tax relief also is evidenced by the enactment of school cost or expenditure controls in recent years. For example, the State may say we will not share in any school expenditure above the state average, or some percentage of state average--say 110 or 120 percent. Or the State may impose absolute maximums on local property tax rates. There is great fear on the part of legislators that any additional money appropriated for education will not replace revenue from local property taxes, but will simply result in higher school expenditures. This attitude reflects a lack of confidence in the decisions of local school boards. The Legislature is taking the stance that in order "to put some iron in the backbone (as one legislator has said) of local school board members, we are going to put on some cost controls that will make it impossible for them to squander all the additional money."

Another factor involved in the current political scene is the matter of teacher bargaining and the whole development of collective bargaining in education. This also is related to a lack of confidence in the policies of local boards, and perhaps also reflects a realization that local boards are caught in a most difficult situation in states where teacher organizations are bargaining state-wide. The resulting whip-saw effect produces a rather one-sided situation. In Wisconsin, local school boards are confronted with a couple of other things that tie their hands. One is a "no-strike" law that is "toothless" and thus fails to prevent public employee strikes. The other is the fact that 180 days of school are required to receive state aid. As a strike continues and the possibility of getting 180 school days in a given calendar year becomes increasingly difficult, local school boards are placed in a very difficult position. They obviously don't want to forfeit their state aid, which greatly reduces their leeway in bargaining with a teacher organization. This situation has attracted the attention of State Legislators and has generated at least some talk of adopting a state wide salary schedule or adopting regional bargaining.

Another area of political concern is that of high cost programs. We all know that all children do not require the same kind of educational program, and that some types of educational programs are more costly than others. There is ample research evidence that high cost programs tend to be associated with densely populated urban areas. In many states there is a coalition of rural and suburban interests in the Legislature who see to it that the urban areas of the state get as little as possible. Such coalitions make it difficult to provide adequately for the high cost programs that characterize densely populated urban areas. This situation must be recognized as a political fact of life and requires careful consideration (and probably some horse-trading) in order to enact legislation that recognizes the heavy educational costs that characterize urban areas.

Finally, I should mention competition with higher education. Higher education traditionally has been funded primarily by direct appropriations from the State Treasury while public elementary and secondary education has relied primarily on revenue from local sources. As we move toward a larger contribution from the state, if not full state funding, the public elementary and secondary school interests will be placed in direct competition with the higher education interests, the highway lobby, the welfare group, the environmentalists and all of the other special interest groups that exert pressure on a legislative body.

Although I am not sure that this knowledge will help you in dealing with these problems as state school board members, I think it is very important that you recognize them. If you recognize that the problems in school finance are not a result of not knowing how to do the job better, but have resulted from an inability to utilize the political process effectively, perhaps we will have taken a long step toward dealing with the educational inequities that exist in almost every state.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY
R. STEPHEN BROWNING
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 17, 1972

I would like to cover roughly three areas: a brief review of the history of education reform in the courts, a short discussion on the Serrano and Rodriguez cases, and finally a more extensive discussion on the Supreme Court argument in San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, held last Thursday, October 12th.

To begin the discussion of the quest for equal educational opportunity through the courts, I would like to go back 76 years to 1896 to what was, in my judgment, the first significant Supreme Court decision on education reform - Plessy v. Ferguson. The Plessy plaintiffs were black children who claimed that they had been denied equal educational opportunities because they were forced to go to segregated schools. The Supreme Court agreed with them and ruled that, if there are separate educational facilities for the races, they must be equal facilities. That rule guided the Supreme Court for about 50 years. During that time there were a number of cases, brought by black children claiming inequalities in educational opportunities and courts really were in the business of taking long and close looks at educational facilities to see if they were equal.

A second dimension of equal educational opportunity emerged in 1950 when the U.S. Supreme Court was faced with a case (Sweat v. Painter) in which a young Texan claimed that he was denied the opportunity to attend the University of Texas Law School because he was black. The State of Texas countered this claim by saying that Mr. Sweat could attend the State's recently established black law school which had facilities equal to those of the University of Texas Law School. To this the U.S. Supreme Court replied that the equality of the facilities, notwithstanding, the law school established for blacks simply did not have many of the intangible facilities that make the University of Texas such a great law school (e.g. reputation, alumni, etc.).

A third dimension of equal educational opportunity, as seen by the courts, is the requirement that there should be racial equality. This aspect of equal educational opportunity is typified by the historic Brown v. Board of Education decision of 1954, which held that racially segregated schools are inherently unequal.

A fourth dimension of equal educational opportunity, "equal outcomes," is a principle that was pressed before the courts but never adopted. It calls for equality of achievement

irrespective of a child's background. Relying upon the rationale supporting the passage of Title I - that is, the notion that more money should be spent on the education of kids who are behind in school - in the mid-1960's a number of attorneys around the country begun to argue that States are constitutionally required to spend on children according to their educational needs. The first case of this type, McInnis v Ogilvie, arose in Illinois. The plaintiff children in the McInnis suit claimed that they were poor; that they were further behind in school than other children in other districts who were receiving more money for their public education; and that they should get at least as much money as the children in the richest districts and maybe more. The court rejected their argument with a pronouncement to the effect that it lacked the ability to decide what children's educational needs are; that the courts are not policy makers; and finally, that the plaintiffs' dilemma, if resolved, was the problem of the state legislature and not the courts. In 1969, the U.S. Supreme Court took the case on appeal and agreed with the lower court's dismissal of the McInnis complaint.

So by 1970 apparently there were only three dimensions of equal educational opportunity as defined by the courts: equal facilities, equal intangible factors, and racial equality. All three, incidentally, were defined in a racial context.

This brings us to Serrano v. Priest, a decision which, in my judgment, came largely as a result of our earlier defeat in McInnis. Serrano represents basically a very conservative approach to equal education opportunity. It is not a decision in which a court thrusts upon the States the burden of adopting a particular educational policy. It does not tell them they have to provide equal facilities; it does not tell them to provide certain services or more money for certain children. It simply tells them that education expenditures must be "fiscally neutral"; that is, they cannot be based on local wealth.

The Serrano decision came largely as a result of law professors and other students of education and constitutional law sitting around asking "what is wrong with the current system?" "Why are children being treated unequally; why do some children get much less educational resources than others?" They concluded that these inequalities exist because educational expenditures were determined largely by local wealth and that there are huge variations in local wealth existing within most states. For example, in some states there are some districts that are five times as rich as the poorest district. In other states, districts might be 100 times as rich. In response to this problem some lawyers began to argue that because education is a state function, it just is not fair that poor districts are

unable to raise as much money as wealthy districts. And, as you know, the California Supreme Court bought that argument in the Serrano case.

It is important at this point to recognize that the California Supreme Court did not say that any inequality in expenditures would be unconstitutional; the court simply said that only the expenditure inequalities caused by local wealth disparities are unconstitutional.

Does that mean some inequalities in expenditures would be constitutional? I think so. For example, should you want to spend three times as much on a mentally retarded child as on a normal child or twice as much on an educationally disadvantaged child as on a normal child, it would be, in my judgement, constitutional. (I commend to you the differential educational expenditure ratios that Dr. Rossmiller developed for the National Educational Finance Project.) The point is that, according to the rationale of Serrano, you can have inequalities, so long as they are not based on local wealth.

But where does that leave us? It is now October 1972 - 14 months after the California Supreme Court announced the principle of fiscal neutrality. Now there are now about 50 Serrano-type suits pending in some 30 states around the country. Thus far six of them have been decided in favor of the plaintiffs, adopting the theory that a system will be unconstitutional if it bases expenditures on local wealth. In short, is it fair to say yet that fiscal neutrality is the law of the land? The answer, of course, rests with the U.S. Supreme Court. It may soon provide us with the answer when it decides the appeal of San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez.

SAN ANTONIO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT V. RODRIGUEZ

A BRIEF HISTORY

The Rodriguez case comes from Texas, a state where there are enormous disparities in local wealth. Indeed some of you may know of the anomalous situation in Texas where one school district is so rich that in 1968 it spent $11,000 per student, while another district was so poor that it could manage to spend only $197 per student. I frequently ask people what they think that wealthy district does with an expenditure of $11,000 per student. Perhaps it has a student - teacher ratio of one to one. Or maybe it sends its students around the world each summer. I don't pretend to know how that wealthy school district in Texas spends its money. All I know is that there are enormous educational expenditure disparities in Texas.

The Rodriguez case arose in 1967 when a private attorney was contacted by a group of community people whose children attended public school in a very poor school district near San Antonio, Texas called the Edgewood School District. Edgewood at that time was about 75% Mexican-American and was one of the poorest school districts in the State. The Edgewood School District residents taxed themselves very high and yet were only able to raise locally about $30 per pupil - several hundred dollars less per pupil than that raised by neighboring districts. The people came to see this attorney and said "we are having a terrible time with the school board; we feel that they are inept and inefficient and that they are failing to provide our children with an adequate education." The attorney and his clients sat down and discussed the problem and soon decided that the problem wasn't so much the ineptness of the school board but the district's lack of adequate resources to build, maintain and staff adequate schools. (One story has it that the Edgewood School District is so poor that each teacher is allotted a single piece of chalk at the start of each day and when the day ends the piece of chalk must be returned to the storeroom.)

The lawyer suggested that it was the State's responsibility to maintain equality in the public schools and that the State had failed its responsibilities. The community people decided to sue.

All of these events occurred in 1967 - before there was any national publicity on school finance reform in the courts. For the next three years, the attorney and his clients worked hard to develop evidence to prove that in Texas there is almost a perfect correlation between local district wealth and the amounts spent by school districts on each pupil. They were able to prove the existence of a strong inverse correlation between the racial composition of school districts, and the amounts spent in school districts (i.e., the higher the proportion of minority enrollment, the lower the per pupil expenditure). Similarily they proved a very close correlation between the personal wealth of people in school districts and the amount spent in school districts. All of this evidence was presented to a three judge federal court, and two days before Christmas of 1971, the Texas school finance system was declared unconstitutional. In doing so, the Court relied upon the rationale of the Serrano opinion, when it found that the Texas system was based on local wealth and was therefore unconstitutional as a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The case was then appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and on June 7, the Supreme Court accepted the case. Briefs were submitted over the Summer, and the case was argued last Thursday, (October 12, 1972.).

I listened to the argument and talked to a lot of people afterwards. Everyone seemed very, very confused about the argument. A number of press people called me and said "my gosh, what was this whole argument about?" "What were they talking about up there?" I would like to spend about five or ten minutes with you trying to explain the principles involved in the argument, because I think it may help you understand the Supreme Court's opinion when it finally decided the Rodriguez case.

First of all, many lay people these days have the notion that the U.S. Supreme Court is continually putting its nose into everybody's business and telling them how to run their affairs. Despite this widely held belief, there is actually little basis for it. Principles have been established over the course of the last 180 years that make the Supreme Court very, very cautious about entering into the checks and balances of government. Despite the fact that some people think the Supreme Court declares unconstitutional nearly all the state statutes that it can get its hands on, there are fewer than 200 instances in the Supreme Court's 190 year history where it declared a statute unconstitutional.

Back to the Rodriguez case. The important legal considerations in the Rodriguez case center around the equal protection clause of the United States Constitution. The Equal Protection Clause states in pertinent part that States may not deny their citizens the equal protection of its laws. The Clause became part of the Constitution in 1866 with the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment. Yet for nearly 90 years following its passage the courts said it really did not mean that states could not protect its people unequally. Rather, the courts said that states could lawfully protect people unequally so long as they could give some reason for its unequal treatment. So, for example, if you happen to be five feet eight and want to join a police force, you may not be able to do it if your state treats short people unequally. Even if you are a tough little guy or gal who could arrest any bandit around, the police force might say "well we only let people on the police force if they are six feet tall, because people six feet tall and over are better fighters." That, in legal terms is a "rational basis," and the Supreme Court would not intervene. It would simply say that in this case small police applicants were lawfully treated unequally because the state supplied a rational or reasonable basis for its unequal classification.

In these cases, the Supreme Court typically does not look into the state's justifications for their unequal classifications to see whether the reasons offered really have merit. However,

that approach has begun to change ever so slightly in the last 20 years. In a few cases, involving either fundamental rights (such as the right to vote, the right to travel, and the right to counsel) or invidious classifications (such as race or wealth), the court has said, "wait a minute, perhaps we should take a little closer look into the reasons for these unequal classifications." The best example of these cases are those involving racial classifications. Over the years there have been a series of state laws passed, particularly in the South, which classify races and treat minorities unequally. Under the Court's new approach, when it looked into the reasons for these unequal racial classifications, it decided that they were not justifiable.

Similarly, the Supreme Court got very interested in voting rights cases and decided it really wasn't fair to treat people unequally with respect to voting. Take the poll tax cases as an example. A $2.00 poll tax may not sound like very much to most of the people in the audience today. However, in some counties in Virginia in 1965, some people only made $8.00 a day, and a $2.00 poll tax meant a sacrifice of a quarter of one day's wages to go to the polls. In response to that predicament, the Supreme Court in the landmark case of Harper v. Virginia said in effect "no, you can't classify on the basis of wealth when there is an important interest like voting involved."

At the same time the Court was carving out an exception to the rational basis rule, an exception to the exception was emerging. This was called the "compelling state interest rule," and it works in the following manner. If a state sponsored unequal classification is constitutionallly suspect and if it affects fundamental rights, it may still be constitutional if the state can show compelling interest (i.e., a very, very important reason) for maintaining this unequal classification.

As it happens, there is one interest emerging that Court may recognize as a compelling interest - that is the interest of "local control." The U.S. Supreme Court two years ago, in a California case called James v. Valtierra, said that communities can keep out low income people and not provide them with low cost housing, if the majority of the community says they don't want that kind of housing. The Supreme Court recently exhibited a similar attraction to local control when, it showed some divisions on desegregation rights. For the past 18 years all decisions from the Supreme Court on school desegregation have been unanimous. However, in a Spring 1972 decision regarding a school district in Emporia, Virginia, there were four justices who dissented from upholding a lower court desegregation order because of their concern that the local school districts actions were protected by its right to exercise local control over the operation of the schools.

With this as a little background, I think you may perhaps have a better idea of what ensued in the Supreme Court last Thursday. The argument was held between two attorneys. The first attorney, plaintiff's counsel, is the scrappy little attorney from San Antonio , Texas I mentioned earlier. He is basically a trial lawyer, and he has had very little appellate court experience. Moreover, he had never before argued a case in frontof the U.S. Supreme Court, and I need not tell you that he was scared to death. His adversary was a very distinguished Professor of Law from the University of Texas named Charles Allen Wright, who has written the book on civil procedure and is a very elegant Supreme Court advocate. I had seen him perform earlier in the week when he represented Howard Hughes in a case involving a $137 million default judgment.

The argument began with Charles Allen Wright when he said something like the following. "We may have inequalities in Texas but I tell you that the most important thing in education today is to have innovation and variety, and our system provides that. In Texas, because we have local funding and localities can determine themselves how much they want to put on education, we provide innovation and variety. In short, we think local control is what we view to be our compelling interest to maintain our system."

Then Mr. Wright proceeded to launch into a long attack on a school finance plan called "District Power Equalizing" (hereafter D.P.E.). It was about this time that people in the court room began thinking to themselves - "what is this man talking about." "What D.P.E. have to do with this case in Texas?" "Texas doesn't have a D.P.E. system, and no one in Texas is proposing such a system, so why is this important?"

The reason it is important for the Supreme Court argument was that it was up to the plaintiffs to show not only that there were great inequalities in Texas that affected a fundamental interest - education, but more importantly, they had to show there was a less onerous alternative than the present system. And, with the defendants' continued emphasis on local control and the Supreme Court's increasing propensity to view local control as an important constitutional interest, it became incumbent on the plaintiffs to convince the court that there were alternatives that could provide local control while eliminating or reducing educational inequalities. The particular alternative that has been discussed so widely in literature as having these two qualities is district power equalizing.* The value of district power equalizing is that it does

* on the following page

away with most of the disparities complained of by plaintiffs and yet it still leaves local control. Local districts can decide how much they want to spend. So the first time you can have real local control, not local control for the rich districts only.

The interesting thing about district power equalizing is that a majority of the taxpayers in a school district can decide on how much they want to spend for education. But is that fair? What happens to minority taxpayers who want to spend more on education? This difficult and thorny question was not lost on the Court in the Rodriguez argument. On the one hand it is important to have systems of finance which do not affect unequally the provision of education. On the other hand, to the extent that local control embraces the need for localities to determine how much they want to spend for education, it is clear that local control is inconsistent with equal educational opportunity. Thus the court was left with a dilemma - a classical balancing task. Picture the scales of justice with equal educational opportunity pitted against local control.

That dilemma was, in my judgment, the only important aspect of the Rodriguez argument. The rest of the argument was interesting, but I don't think it will have any bearing on the court's final decision. However, since I am not a registered prophet or forecaster, I had better tell you about other aspects of the Rodriguez argument.

One Justice asked whether the Court should not examine the Texas system of funding schools to see if it makes any sense? And if it finds that the system gives more money to the rich, without any educational reason for that, the Justice queried whether the court should not conclude that the system is irrational. The plaintiffs' lawyer responded by saying that in his judgment the Texas system for funding schools is irrational, but if you just apply that test to it, maybe that will mean that people will challenge every municipal service that is funded in the same way as education. That is, they will want sewers to be equal, roads to be equal and so on. The justices seemed to understand that maybe that was right; maybe you had to have a little stronger test for education. In short, maybe the rationality test wasn't the right test.

*D.P.E. is a system for funding schools whereby any given level of tax effort will raise the same amount of money -it doesn't make any difference whether a district is rich or poor. For example, under D.P.E. if a school district wants to tax at 30 mills,the levy will raise, say, $800. Thus, if your district is poor as a church-mouse or has a DuPont Plant within its borders, at any given level of tax rate you will raise the same amount of money for education.

Another Justice said what about the inter-state disparities; aren't they really as big as the intra-state disparities? The plaintiff's lawyer said yes they are large, but that in Rodriguez the Court was faced with a Fourteenth Amendment case, in which the state's responsibility for funding education was involved. The Plaintiff's attorney went on to argue that the federal government has no constitutional responsibility for funding education. It can fund education if it wants to, but it doesn't have to. So it would not be possible for the Courts to require the federal government to equalize educational expenditures among the states.

There were a couple of elements in the case that were very striking to the justices. Justic Douglas was very interested in the fact that it appeared that in Texas many of the school districts that had the highest concentrations of minority children seemed to get the least amount of money. Another justice on the other hand said, yes that may be true, but is it really incument on the plaintiffs to show the State really intended this to happen. It may just be an abberation. Maybe they set up the system, and it just so happened that some of the districts with high concentrations of minority children get less money.

There was also concern expressed by the Justices about the amounts of educational resources available to poor people. In the Rodriguez case there was evidence in the lower court record which showed that the property poor districts tended to have the highest concentrations of poor people with lower personal incomes. That struck an interesting note with Justice Blackman, when he said something like: "wait a minute - I'm from Minnesota and I recall that some of the poorest people we had in our state lived in the iron range country, and the iron range country happened to contain some of the wealthiest school districts in the state. The plaintiff's attorney allowed that that could be true, but it didn't happen to be the case in Texas. The defense throughout was the argument continually trying to raise these points about other state systems. For example, Mr. Wright urged upon the court a study about the Kansas school finance system which found that there was not a relationship between personal poverty and district poverty. Similarly, he alluded to a study in California which purported to show the absence of a relationship between the minority composition of school districts and district expenditures. One of the Justices responded to these diversions by saying that this is a Texas case - the plaintiff's don't really have to explain that things are unequal throughout the country; they are just saying that in Texas they are getting less money.

There were several other elements in the case which I felt were very interesting, but I will name just one more. It

has to do with the claim of the State of Texas that it provides a minimum education. One Justice said, are you really providing the minimum, have you proven that? The State's counsel responded "oh yes, we are providing the minimum." (Of course the plaintiff's attorney was about to jump out of his chair, because he had spent so much time showing that there were some districts that just did not get an adequate education.) Then the justice asked the State's counsel whether Texas is constitutionally required to give a minimum education. Surprisingly, the State's counsel allowed that the State was constitutionally required to do so, and that Texas had met that requirement with its minimum foundation program. The plantiff's counsel, when asked the same question argued that the State of Texas does not provide a minimum education, but even if it did he argued that that really isn't what his case is all about. He went on to argue that the equal protection clause does not say you are supposed to treat some people minimumly and some better.

I will say in closing that the Rodriguez decision probably has been decided already. The Court meets every Friday to decide the cases argued that week. Justices are then designated to write their opinion. If this procedure was followed last week, it may mean that Rodriguez has already been decided and that someone has already begun writing the opinion. However, if any of you have ever read a Supreme Court opinion, you know they are very skillfully drafted, and that they must take hundreds and hundreds of hours to write. Consequently, I suspect that we may get a decision in the case at the earliest by January and by June at the latest.

Now in terms of the votes. I think we very clearly have four votes for the plaintiffs. They are Justice Marshall who didn't sit through the case, because his brother had died the day before, Justice Brennan, Justice Douglas and Justice White. Whether or not we will pick up that fifth crucial vote will depend upon how the rest of the Court chooses to deal with what I will call the "Saltonstall dilemma." That is Mr. Saltonstall was up here earlier saying on the one hand we want to have people treated equally, on the other hand we want to give people the opportunity to let them do something with education. That is basically the libertarian v. the egalitarian view. Both are very strong principles, but I do not believe they are irreconcilable, and I think the court will see it that way too. In short, I hold a rather guarded optimism that the Supreme Court will uphold the plaintiff's claim, perhaps on very narrow grounds. In any event, whatever the Supreme Court does with Rodriguez, it seems clear to me that State legislatures are really beginning to grapple with the issues and substantial changes in school finance systems are in the making.

Thank you very much.

Address Delivered By
JAMES A. HAZLETT
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 17, 1972

Thank you Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. Starting this month and going through till August of 73, between five and six hundred trained people will enter over 2,000 schools and homes throughout the country and present a group of people at ages 9, 13, 17, 26 to 35, what might be called a test booklet, in which there will be printed questions in science and mathematics considered appropriate for the grade levels. This means that just under 100,000 people in these four age groups will participate in the national assessment of mathematics and science. Just as the same number of different people, last year took part in an assessment in music and social studies, next year they will take part in the assessment of art and career and occupational development. These 100,000 people have been selected by what is called a random sampling method in which sufficient number of individuals, broken down by four regions of the country, and by sex and by black, non-black and size and type of community, will respond. This will give us a picture of what all people in these age groups can do in these subject areas by these breakdowns.

The trained people going to the schools, some five to six hundred of them will carry with them packages of what we call assessment questions. Historically the word "test" is not being used. With these booklets plus tape recorders, they will go into the offices and they will ask for a group of students already selected by random methods to assemble in groups not to exceed 12 in a room provided by the school. When these youngsters have convened, the Administrator takes out the tape recorder and passes out the booklets and after establishing the proper rapport will ask the students to begin when the audiotape begins, and the tape will give the instructions orally as well as having them on the printed page. This process minimizes the dependency of youngsters on reading and reduces the chance of a biased score because many cannot read well. In every school and household this same type of administration occurs. For about 45 minutes the students will go through the booklet. They will find a question in science and the next one might be mathematics. It is a little different from some of the tests they have taken, in that it alternates subjects. In the end of the booklet they will fill out some information - very brief - about themselves, and then the Administrator will retrieve the booklets and excuse the testees. The booklets will be

retrieved by the Administrator to the Measurement Research Center in Iowa City, a Division of Westinghouse Learning Corp., where they are scored. If they are multiple choice, they will be scored on a machine. If they are open ended or essay type questions, they will be scored by a professional scoring procedure. The information there will be put on computer tapes and eventually after some organization of the material, it will wind up before five of the top Statisticians in the country. Dr. John Tukey of Princeton, Dr. Frederick Mosteller of Harvard, Dr. Lyle V. Jones down at the University of North Carolina, Dr. William E. Coffman, Lindquist Professor of Educational Measurement at Iowa City and Dr. John Gilbert who is in the Computer Center at Harvard.

Here these men, some of whom have been working on this project as long as ten years with very little compensation, are challenged by the largest amount of educational data that has ever been assembled. Opportunity to experiment with all kinds of statistical techniques are endless. They will try to present to the country for the first time a description of the attainment levels of young people in this country. It has been said by some that if this kind of thing had been done in the 1930's, about the time the Economists were experimenting with such things as the gross national product and various kinds of economic indices, and that there could have been developed some kind of an educational index, some kind of descriptive material which would have told us about the attainment of young people in this country.

There are those of us who think we need dependable descriptive evidence on the condition of education in this country. That was one of the motivations that lead back in 1963 to the suggestion that there be a national assessment. It has become the educational research project with the longest gestation period in history, spending between six and seven million dollars.

The items in these booklets given to the youngsters have taken about three years to prepare. They go through a complicated process by which the National Assessment staff brings together subject matter specialists, school practitioners like classroom teachers and principals and laymen. They sit down and take objectives like what are the objectives of teaching science in the schools? They will conclude such things as, "will some people need to know certain facts and principles about science?" Or young people need to know how to take these facts and principles and apply them in certain situations not just to know them but to utilize them. We need to know what young people think about science and scientific methods. The experts formulated what are those things in the classroom toward which instructions should be directed. Then when the objectives were formulated, the

staff brought together subject matter, classroom practitioners, people and they started with these objectives in writing test questions and exercises they think fit into the objectives.

Hundreds and hundreds of such questions were written and reviewed by many including lay people. Are these the kinds of questions that you think are sensible and appropriate for a nine year old? Is this the kind of information that you would like to have your child know? Should he perform these skills? Is there anything in this that would be harmful to any individual? Does this represent an invasion of privacy? William Buckley is very glad to respond to these questions and Senator Wayne Morris is very glad to respond. You would be surprised at the wide representation of people that have taken time to participate. Out of this complicated process there came a selection of exercises, supposed to be fitting under these objectives and presumably many questions that everybody could answer.

The statisticians and the staff took all these questions and in science there would be maybe 500 of them. Not every student takes every question because in the sampling process it is possible to get a large number of questions more accurably to more people than if you try to measure every pupil. Don't ask me the theory behind it all but that is one of the virtues of random sampling.

Ultimately about half of the questions of any exercise are used. The other half are not released. They will be given five years later. The same questions are not released twice because one of the objectives of national assessment, which is described as an educational census, really is to see if there has been any progress or lack of progress over a period of time. After each of the exercises we will say the percent that got each answer, X-percent got this answer, another percent got this answer, etc. and the correct answer is identified. The percentages are not summed up into scores; there are no standards. We are criticized because people say "what does it mean - is it good that 65% of the nine year olds know this, or is it bad?" We have taken the position, historically that this is like census. This is the fact - now the public must decide whether it is good or bad. We are in the process right now of encouraging people to take a look at our material and to tell whether they think it good. For example we have asked the National Science Teachers Association to come up next March with a booklet or brochure entitled, "What do National Assessment science results mean to the science teachers of this country.?" We have asked the great cities research councils to come into Denver - Directors of Research from twenty three or four cities. We

asked them, "Do you see anything in the National Assessment material and the results that might be meaningful to the big cities?" We would like to ask the National Association of State Boards of Education also to participate (I noticed in a 1971 resolution, "The Association further believes that state educational agencies should provide fine leadership in evaluation of all programs which involve student time, and public funds.") We would like to see now if NASBE could get a group of people together long enough - to go through some of this and tell us whether or not they think there is any value educationally in the material or any adaptability to states. We will pay the travel expenses and maybe a little time on the part of somebody who will do the paperwork. Would you like to do that? We feel there is no use in having a national assessment if it isn't meaningful and helpful and does not meet the objectives of assisting in the development of educational policy. We don't think this can be done immediately, but maybe over a span of time there will be virtue in it.

When this National Assessment started it almost didn't get off the ground. The American Association of School Administrators wrote a letter in February of 1967 and said to every superintendent, "we don't want you to participate in this thing." The ASCD - American Supervision of Curriculum and Development passed a resolution condemning it. Both organizations were afraid of national curriculum and national testing projects making comparisons among states.

Now all the states, almost without exception, are at some state of development in a state assessment program. When they began asking ECS for help, we were somewhat in a dilemma, because ECS was a state service agency and national assessment is not supposed to compare the states.

We have held two workshops in the summer.. One last summer was attended by representatives of more than 30 states for the purpose of explaining national assessment and assisting them to see how the national assessment model might be adaptable to a state assessment. Paul Campbell who is with the State Assessment Center of Educational Testing Service is working with states and they have a different kind of model. The national assessment model can be modified to some extent by states. There has just come from the state of Connecticut, a state assessment of reading that is almost a duplication of the national assessment reading project, using many of the same questions. The information was broken down by big cities and educational level of parents and things like that. In just looking through it,the report tells me off-hand that Connecticut in the objectives of reading as set forth does better than the nation as a whole; it does better than the northeast

region, but it does a lot worse in the big cities of Connecticut, than the big cities of the national sample.

Now at least this is a clue, something to look at. Many other states are considering some kind of adaptation of this kind of assessment. This is a new type of educational evaluation, made possibly by the use of random sampling methods, such as are used in the Gallop Polls and other opinion surveys. It is aided by the high speed, large volume computers that manipulate the data. It is made possible by the interests of some of the country's leading statisticians.

The country is badly in need of dependable data. After the world war, schools were criticized because they were not doing a good job in basic fundamentals. Critics asked "Why Johnny Can't Read." Their data were not dependable. We have been criticized in the late 50's and through the 60's because it has suddenly been revealed what we already knew that there is a correlation between school achievement and social class groups.

Kindly let me conclude by mentioning what are some of the gross things that have come out of national assessment since 1969-70. One is that of the four regions of the country on the four subjects that have been assessed and reported, reading, science, writing, and citizenship, the Northeast is consistently higher, than the median of the responses at every age group. The Southeast is consistently lower than the media for the nation. The Central part is just about equal with the median and the far West has a mixed response, with some superiority in the 17 adult ages and a little bit low in the 9 and 13 groups.

The national assessment also verifies the fact that youngsters that have come from families where parents have only had grade school education are way below those whose parents have had a high school education. They in turn are below those who have had some college. Girls do far better than boys in composition. Boys do far better than girls in science. Boys outstrip the girls chiefly because of physical science. The biological sciences show the sexes to be closer.

What we need to begin to do is examine each of these items, and come up with such things as - well in citizenship it is quite evident that people in this field, at any age level are rather ignorant about the structure of their local and state government. They know the federal constitution and federal structure fairly well and much better

than local and state. This should suggest curriculum changes are needed.

I would say that just by looking at about six items in science dealing with student physiology, I am amazed at the ignorance of people about the function of their own bodies.

Well, that is enough for me at this point. I hope you will have some questions about assessment. There are some real problems. Lots of things that we say the schools should do but can't measure. Are we only going to have in our curricula the things which are measurable? Then when you get into the question of accountability everything can't be accounted for.

Address Delivered By
PAUL B. CAMPBELL
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 17, 1972

Let me start out by saying that I have enjoyed working together with Jim Hazlett for quite a while now and rather than start out with the usual introductory speech, I am going to tell Jim that I disagree with him on one issue. The point that I want to make here is not mine. I wish it were. A guy by the name of Robert Evans one time said, "to be important an educational outcome must make a difference, if it makes a difference, then a basis for measurement exists." I would argue then that there really isn't anything of importance that we do that can't be measured some way. I hasten to add that we have a lot to learn about how to measure some very important things and we have not progressed to the place where we can do all we want in measurement. I am not going to give up until we can measure the things that make important differences in education. Forgive me for that little aside, Jim.

There are some very obvious parallels between the national assessment and state assessment activities as well as some very important differences and I think you will see these emerge as I go on. I'd like to talk about state assessment in terms of several very general questions. The first one is why state assessment? What are we doing it for? Well, there are several different groups who have needs for assessment data. Before getting into the context, I would like to diverge very slightly to say I use the word "assessment" interchangeably with "evaluation." I think that probably five to ten years from now we won't be talking very much about assessment anymore. We will still be hung up on that problem of how do we evaluate our programs and have to continue to work on it. So this is not a short term thing, although the bandwagon effect may be rather short termed.

I am going to talk about the need for policy makers to know something about how their programs are working if they are to make intelligent policy. The nature of the programs may change very drastically. The nature of how evaluation is provided may change very drastically but every policy maker, I repeat, has to have some kind of a device for determining how well programs are working if they are to make a policy.

Why do we need assessment? Well, because legislatures need assessments. They make a lot of decisions which usually are involved with such things as the expenditure of funds,

the development of certification for teachers, whether or not we are going to establish a new kind of educational program such as vocational or technical additions, community colleges, higher education programs, etc. In order to make intelligent decisions about these, requires data. Assessment can provide it. Probably the most common use of assessment data would be in determining the allocation of resources. Unfortunately I think at present little data is used for allocation. At least in some instances where I participated, this was true.

This brings us to the third need for assessment that some legislators seem to feel is a purely political need. I would like to define here for a moment, what I mean by politics, Politics is the art of coming together with some kind of a reasonable compromise that takes into account the diverse needs of a lot of different people. As such it is a most honorable profession, if it is done properly. But legislators need issues to give them visibility. They need to be able to find but what is happening in all major social enterprises like education. They need to be able to deal with these in some way and assessment information can provide them with facts.

Well, you know state boards need assessment information too. Program evaluation information I would think is, a major need for state board members but I think you could tell me some other reasons that I may not have thought about. Data should be put into your policy decisions regarding the programs you recommend for your states. State department ne'd assessment data for other reasons too. How will your staff people be allocated or distributed? What kind of things should they work on? In working with several states, we found they were looking for ways to determine what guidance and counseling functions the State department would focus on. If we had some information on what was happening in these several areas we would be able to make these policy decisions much more rationally usually one must depend on intuition or a few specific experiences. We usually do not use a general systematic collection of information on what is happening across the states.

School professionals also need assessment information although they might talk about it in a very different sort of way than some of us do. Jim mentioned the hostility of the AASA and ASCD toward national assessment at a point and time. Right now in many of the local state assessment programs there is, at the very least, a good deal of apprehension on the part of educator groups and sometimes I might add hostility about assessment activities. The reason for this, I think, is a fear of the unknown. I say this because the experiences we have had suggest very strongly that if assessment is properly approached it is a beneficial and well-received. It is possible

to use assessment data incorrectly, just like it is possible to use a car to commit a crime. The car is a useful thing in itself, but not beneficial if used improperly.

People, in my experience, have largely been pretty conscientious people who are seriously interested in the education of kids; but they are very often overwhelmed by responding to the immediate at hand problem as opposed to the long-range. Assessment data which is systematically collected might very well help to take a longer term look.

Parents need assessment data. I am a parent and I suspect most of you are and the assessment data that I want most and I think you want most is how are my children doing right now. Are they making it in the situation or not? An assessment that we talk about on a statewide basis is not very well geared for this purpose and so except as parents look at the overall institution the school, assessment as we talk about it on a statewide basis is not very geared for them.

I have never met a student yet who asked for an assessment of the school system. Everyone I know had an assessment that he had already made. It was most likely based on his own particular experiences. That satisfies him but not the rest of us.

When I was working in Pennsylvania we had some goals which were in the "hard-to-measure" area. Things like "creativity" and "how do I get along with someone who is different than me in race, creed, color?" "Appreciation for human accomplishments" to list a few of the goals that we played around with. One of the things we did was to put together a few things that we thought a person might conceivably do if he were moving toward a goal. We expressed them in terms a kid could react to and tell us "yeah, I think that is something good" or "I think that is something bad" or "No! I wouldn't do this" or "yes! or whatever. We took these out and had groups of youngsters in the school, real live kids and a real live school, react. We would administer the exercises to them and then we would ask a few of them to sit down with us and talk. We had hard questions to deal with "how you feel about having as a close friend someone whose ideas about God were very different than yours? Or "how would you feel about having as a friend someone whose skin color is different than yours", and things of this nature. The kid would say to us, "Yeah, we know what you are after here, these are the big issues you know." They said nobody ever asked us questions like that before. "This is swell", "this is neat." We didn't have trouble at all working with kids when we leveled with them and came out with what it was we were after. We said "look, tell us, we may make

a mistake if you don't." So yes, I think the kids can get a lot of use out of assessment if it is properly approached. Conceivably if the National Assessment model of reporting item data were placed before a group of say high school youngsters in a proper interaction center, where they could tell you what they thought, you could get a lot of good learning activity out of that kind of a situation, so I feel it is useful.

These are some of the "whys" for doing assessment. Some of the misuses might be along the lines of determining whether a teacher's salary goes up or down, I'll get into that a little later. Many states use the system of awarding subsidies on the basis of tests. That is a straight forward and on the face of it reasonable kind of thing to do, but it has a great many dangers because in states where this is happening, I know personally of a good many cases where falsification of one sort or another is happening. It is too easy to do, you can't be secure and protective enough of these kinds of data collections to prevent it from happening. So if it can be done, it involves a lot of danger.

What do we assess? The first thing I think that almost every state program is interested in - how well do kids know their words? Can they read them? Do they know what they mean? The basic skills get in here pretty quickly and pretty solidly.

Secondly, how well can they handle numbers? Can they add, subtract, divide and multiply? I don't think there is any state assessment program that is likely to last very long without taking into account basic mathematic skills and other foundations.

I think we make a serious mistake if we stop there. Charlie Manson can read and write but that didn't prevent him from taking the particular actions for which he was convicted. There is more to living than words and numbers, and schools are asked to deal with more than words and numbers. Therefore, if you are going to deal with any meaningful assessment, you had better get into other areas such as attitudes. We don't measure these well, Usually I suggest you might try one of two areas - the first is the attitude toward the whole business of learning. Is the child motivated to learn?

Another is the notion of self-concept, or how kids feel about themselves as persons. Do they regard themselves worthwhile with value and can they control their environments to some extent etc. There was a certain program conducted which used one self esteem inventory to differentiate among schools. After this had been done, teams were sent to two schools that scored very high and very low on this measure to see if they could find out any differences between these two settings. Well

in many cases they couldn't find very much but they did find some extreme examples where there was a marked difference. The school where the kids scored low on the self-concept measure about control of environment segregated the boys and girls. The girls sat next to the walls, and the boys next to the windows. To move from one class activity to another one didn't just walk out the door and wait till the traffic cleared to walk across the hall. One followed a routine rigamoroll around the building to get to the next classes. There was extreme rigidity in the control of everything that the youngsters did and there was a lot of evidence that kids couldn't in that school say and is very much about what happened to them, except get themselves in trouble. In another school only a few miles away was a school that had a more open kind of atmosphere. I'm not here to advocate the open classroom, except I don't think we know enough about this yet to say whether it is good, bad or indifferent. But at least this one had a more open kind of environment than the one I had just seen. In this school on this scale I am describing to you, the kids scored very much higher than the average. So it looks as though it is possible to do some measuring in kinds of areas which we do think are important for our kids and our schools.

Some other things I think you would be well advised to take into account as you enter assessment programs has to do with the conditions of learning. What are the situations under which learning takes place? National Assessment doesn't touch this very heavily but it tends to get into it when it uses a few indications such as the parents educational level and some things of this sort. Why do this? There are reasons to come up with some indicators associated with performance. If one doesn't collect information of this sort how are we going to have any idea about directions? The Coleman data collected quite a while ago documented something a lot of us suspected for a long time namely that by and large a measure of social economic status is associated with poor performance in schools. There has been a lot of criticism on the Coleman data - some of it valid, but I know probably half a dozen other studies which have collected similar data and they all found the same thing.

You need to collect information on the resources and facilities available. We thought for a long time that you could judge the quality of the school district by the amount of money it spent. There were correlations that supported this notion, but this isn't true anymore. The schools which spend the most money for teachers' salaries aren't necessarily the schools where the kids are performing the best. Now why is that so? Well it is because the interaction between kids,

teachers and materials isn't necessarily a function of the dollar. All that does is provide a base to bring them together. For example, you are looking at self-concept as I mentioned earlier and also the case of the dollar. We reasoned that guidance counselors should contribute to helping a kid see his potential at an adult age, and he ought to feel better about himself. This is the purpose of the guidance counselor. What we found was that the better the ratio of counselors per student, the lower the performance. In other words the more counselors you put into the situation, it would seem on the surface, the less well the students did. Well, we have to dig a little deeper, and I think this emphasizes the point of why we need data and how we use it. So we began to look at this situation and what we began to discover was that we hadn't equipped the counselors. They had hired by Title III and by Title I monies which had been focused on the acute problems in the first place no miracles had been accomplished. One would have been expected to find, a positive association between the presence of counselors and the performance of the kids. The same thing applies to your dollars and your resources. If we are pouring more money into the area where the problems are the greatest, then it is quite likely you will not find a great positive relationship between the money and the performance. As compared elsewhere, the before and after of the same place is another matter.

If a legislature or a Governor hits the state department over its head with an ax and splits its skull, assessment isn't going to come out full grown like that Greek goddess. It takes some time to develop it.

I think we heed to make sure that the data collection procedures you have are valid as we talked earlier. They have to look like the thing you are after, so that you, as a lay person, when you look at a question in an exercise, you can see what it is about. It has to be a self-evident. I think you ought to somehow show the relationship of learning to the conditions and to the learning situations that exists in your state and this will allow you to look at the possible program changes and define some of the directions that ought to be taken.

Reporting has got to be on a level that is understandable to all the people that are concerned. Unless you make use of the results you have wasted the tax payers money by getting involved in assessment. It doesn't do any good by itself. It needs to have an end in sight where we then do something about the problems of education in the states.

The ideal model of assessment in my feelings would be this one. Everyday, in every class, teachers are looking at kids and making some assessment about where this youngster

is in terms of some goal that she may have. The teacher looks at the kids and makes an assessment of how many can do what and how many can't. She then makes some decisions about the program. It may be that little Sussie over here in the corner is really afraid to take part in anything, and the teacher wants to do something to make Sussie feel a little better about herself. Teachers make these assessments all the time, everyday.

The deal assessment ought to be to give the teachers some tools to do this on a more systematic fashion. Imbedded in this might be a few tools to use building wide, so one would have a picture of the school as a whole. These in turn could be aggregated at district level so one could look at that picture and finally you could pull a state picture out of this same set of data. Assessment on these ideal terms would cross levels and also time, because it would be continuous for a year. At the end of this year one could say something about achievement. Across a state one could say a certain percent of the kids could handle a certain kind of thing. The state would have some valuable information on what should be done and what was wanted. Well that would be the ideal.

Address Delivered By
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
Banquet
October 17, 1972

Distinguished guests on the dais and in the audience, fellow members and friends in NASBE:

Normally on this occasion, the President gives a review of major events of his term of office; and discusses what seem to be important trends for NASBE involvement in the future.

Once again NASBE is most fortunate, and honored, to have a distinguished educator as a banquet speaker.

Sharing a platform with Maurice and making a speech on any subject in his presence is awesome. Remember, he was for many years the Chief Executive of Encyclopedia Brittanica. Speaking in his presence is a little like discussing arson and music with Nero.

To allow him maximum time, I will only touch on few of the high spots of the last twelve months.

The opportunity by rotation to be the 1971-72 host for the Big Six Workshopt and Legislative Conference afforded NASBE the ideal framework for expressing its views to national policy makers in education. NASBE is now fully recognized as an equal partner among national associations, representative of educational governance at all levels. NASBE is now in the forefront of those groups fully identified with retaining states' rights and prerogatives in proper perspective, yet advocating important educational programs requiring federal legislative and fiscal support.

Many concepts of state/federal educational relationships, supported for several years now by NASBE by resolution and by action with others, are in force in Public Law 92-318, the "Education Amendments of 1972."

Other high spots are covered in my Foreword to NASBE's Title V brochure: "Six Crucial Issues in Education"; and in the "President's Message" on page 2 of this 1972 Convention Program.

Now let us for a few moments contemplate ongoing NASBE concerns for the future. Problems seem to be accumulating at the state level -- as there always will be -- for the

achievement of "excellence in education". NASBE, however, always treats problems as real opportunities dressed in their working clothes.

Therefore, State Board members must add to their decision-making stamina, the ability to select and present with adequate emphasis the priorities currently needed to enhance the quality of education.

The new phenomenon now really emerging in our new system of federalism, was first observed and discussed over a decade ago by the late James E. Allen and by James B. Conant; and their writing very early displayed a sophisticated sensibility to a mounting malaise, stemming from an ever increasing disparity between the fiscal and funding potentials of various units of government engaged in the same function at the same level, and the true needs and earnest desires of the citizens residing within those units. In short, it is today quite apparent that many functions best performed at a given level of government are not necessarily, adequately or equally, funded by that same level.

We must continue to give strong assurances from our state level to local Boards, whose members are officers of the state, that local control is not in further jeopardy; particularly timely if the state picks up almost full funding along with staffing and personnel problems. With fewer negotiable problems in their hands, local Boards should spend more time on effective local control on programming, curriculum needs and guidance more responsive to the local moves. This needs very adept state leadership.

Indecision and no action; in other words, failure of laymen and professionals together to take strong positions on knotty and/or unpleasant problems; failure to make priority choices and take Board decisions when they are most timely; have inevitably led to many important decisions in matters relating to educational affairs being made in the Courts or by Legislative mandates. The overall, long term consequences, and all-too-often the dollar costs of judicial or legislative fiat, can be onerous; often coming at a time when the most affected echelon of government may be unprepared to assume greater burdens.

Other important problems in education are still before us. Teacher preparation and training, both pre-and in-service, needs tremendous improvement. State Boards must support the enlightened professionals who are leading us out of the thicket of slavish adherence to the "time-service" syndrome in teacher training and certification by adopting "exposure -

performance - behavioral" criteria. NASBE is proud to have provided a great springboard for Helen Hartle as the leader of the Inter-State Teacher Certification Program to which, about 30 states now adhere.

There are so many compelling reasons why teacher training and certification must remain the prime concern of State Boards. Take for example the lack of emphasis in so many school districts on "drop-outs" still physically in the classroom, who might better be described as "turned-offs".

Just not enough time and effort is yet being expended in the schools on certain primeval skills that students must acquire, so that education -- the juxtaposition of two minds, one slightly more experienced -- can be most rewarding. A sound basic reading skill is the essential fundamental, paramount ingredient. Basic skills in mathematics, and a basic understanding of how our democratic system and its institutions function, are of course also important. But it is hard to over-emphasize functional illiteracy as a constant barrier between teacher and learner; functional illiteracy as an important cause of physical and mental dropouts; and functional illiteracy as a basic cause of general unrest and malaise.

Need for basic mathematical skills is obvious in most walks of life in today's world. Failure to provide them is itself a factor contributing to a feeling by too many that they unable to compete in a world so devoted to numbers and to technological life styles.

Because the general unhappiness and uneasy posture of so many malcontents can be traced to abyssmal ignorance of how our whole system of governance, and the institutions operating within it, really function, the need for better training for responsible citizenship requires greater emphasis.

The 26th Amendment gave swift recognition to an important segment of our population but is the eighteen-year-old really prepared to exercise the frachise? Is there anything readily identifiable in the curriculum -- referred to in the past as "civics" -- designed to achieve a better understanding of, and what can be accomplished with, our federalist system of government and the processes of our democracy; or designed to inculcate appreciation of the right of every man, woman and child in the country to do his or her thing, without fear of interference and/or reprisal, as long as they do not radically interfere with or endanger their fellows; or design to insist on recognition of the inalienable right of all to enjoy "due process"?

Are we progressing fast enough in this area? Certainly greater emphasis is imperative now more than ever because voting starts for so many citizens even before they leave high school, by graduation or otherwise. Perhaps too much publicity continues to be given to controversial behavior by today's youth and too many complaints registered about their habits, their dress, their modes of relaxation and other superficial manifestations of discontent with "the establishment". Most certainly, too little attention has unfortunately been given to their concerns and dissatisfactions with the way many of our established institutions function. While many of these concerns may be well founded, others are rooted in a total lack of understanding of how and why institutions of a free society operate. Although an everincreasing percentage is college trained, a significant majority of citizens ends its academic training somewhere at the high school level. It is difficult, therefore, to pay too much attention to the whole process of education in the high school and most particularly to preparation for responsible citizenship.

Certainly a much better groundwork in "civics" must be laid in our elementary and secondary schools. Most of our citizens are woefully ignorant about which level of government has jurisdiction over the various segments of their daily lives. Congressmen constantly receive mail discussing problems which should be referred to city hall or state capitol. Even when the citizen realizes the problem falls in the purview of local or state government, he is too often at a loss to know which department or agency has responsibility over the subject in question. The citizen, young or old alike, even doubts whether anyone in government is listening; he feels a sense of futility in the face of big government whose reactions often appear less and less directly responsive to his needs. Clearly, better instruction in civics -- better instruction in "responsible citizenship" and in understanding how governmental processes work -- is imperative.

But unadorned instruction, no matter how complete and accurate, cannot really teach "civics" for practical application unless there is meaningful dialogue concerning developing day-to-day issues with more experienced citizens, outside the schools. We risk producing a whole generation filled with factual knowledge, but which has failed to acquire the ability to communicate not only with its elders, but with anyone else as well. Young people are now assailing much of the value structure within our society, and on many issues they would appear on the side of the angels -- environmental quality is a case in point. But, are they really so right -- constant bitter attacks on a public utility while leading lives constantly using more energy? Do they know how to work for change without first destroying all possibility of progress?

Have we as adults failed our young people by not teaching them of the change that has taken place within our country and of the transformation of institutional arrangements that is constantly taking place? Worse yet, have we failed to make them understand how they can by orderly, albeit, slow, procedures transform the system to achieve new goals? Does not such failure tend to embarrass young people and also tend to exacerbate the bitterly abrasive postures young people often assume towards some institutions designed to advance progressive ideas -- such as schools?

Young people often seem to have suffered only because ignorance has unwittingly colored their behavior. Educational programs need vigorous rethinking and experimentation in order to reshape them to reflect new concerns, particularly in the whole field of the social sciences. It will be interesting but costly, if we have to wait too much longer to determine whether or not John W. Gardner's assessment of priorities was correct when he said of educators: "They preside all too complacently over a system that is not working. They could change it; but often they are obstacles to reform rather than its promoters." We must take steps to nullify this pessimistic prospect. Teachers -- and parents -- should be among the foremost practitioners of quality leadership and of setting good examples.

Under stress of social changes; under stress of financial stringencies; under stress of lack of confidence; State Boards must face up to their constitutional or statuatory mandates. Where else but at the state level is it more fitting for a group of dedicated citizens to work for the restoration of the confidence of the general public, or to justify to the Governor and to the State Legislature the philosophy and fiscal responsibility which they must assume adequately to implement the traditional and increasing role of the states in education?

A state board of education can best establish priorities for the most efficacious allocation of state appropriations; and certainly a state board should be best able to meld the state's educational dollars with dollars flowing in from the national level and with dollars still available from the local level. Given today's circumstances, and in view of the close cooperation already existing between the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Association of State Boards of Education (with cooperation from the Education Commission of the States) the state should be the level of government best suited to keep aspirations and capabilities in an efficacious and productive balance. In short, the state board should be the focal point to ensure maximum use of educational resources, both fiscal and physical.

Full comprehension of the lack of fiscal independent State Boards is essential. These are parlous times: in general because of wide spread societal malaise and unrest, and of greater concern to us at the state level, a general impatience and dissatisfaction with the whole educational process on the part of the tax payers. Too long reform of education by itself has casually been thought to be the remedy of all societal ills, and this became the whipping boy of outraged public opinion, often followed by irascible legislature fiat and/or executive actions; all three sometimes blind and counterproductive. This period, it seems to me, is perhaps the most challenging job for the future of State Boards. We must be prepared to establish, advocate and defend priorities. Given potentially greater funding responsibility seemingly now devolving upon the states, board members must recognize that, lacking fiscal independence, the reputation of education must be restored in the minds and hearts of the legislatures who appropriate funds, and certainly in the minds and hearts of the tax payers who provide it. If the will to support education is there, American ingenuity will find the proper method of financing it.

Remember that elected officials listen to groups rather than individuals. The states have faced rising tides and storms before. NASBE has acquired many other important groups as friends. So, with all the opportunities and friends at hand, and using all the professional skills available to State Boards, let us not as individuals nor as a group in NASBE be like the little girl who snitched her mother's corset and then found she didn't have the guts to use it.

So, take good heart, even though State Boards temporarily seem to have fewer friends. Take heart from Edmund Burke's great speech: "Those who would carry on great public schemes must be proof against the worst fatiguing delays; the most mortifying disappointments; the most shocking insults, and, what is worst of all, the presumptuous judgment of the ignorant upon their design." In the struggle ahead to enhance "excellence in education" we need in concert to utilize all the help, all the backing, and guidance of lay and professional expertise as never before. Drawing upon the slogan born during another beleaguered moment, NASBE should say to its many lay and professional friends and well wishers: "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition."

Thank you all for the opportunity you have given me. Thank you for your loyal and unwavering support.

Address Delivered By
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Es Moines, Iowa
Annual Business Meeting
October 18, 1972

Fellow members of NASBE -- what I really mean is all my good friends in NASBE -- the 1972 Annual Business Meeting of the National Association of State Boards of Education is now in session.

Before concluding NASBE's official business, may I remind you -- if you have not already been looking forward to it, -- that this is the last occasion over which I shall preside as President. One brief moment, then, if I may, please, to do two things for the record which I have done at the Board meeting last Sunday afternoon.

NASBE is completing its 12th year. It has been a busy one. It has been an exciting one. In the more than 30 years that I have been getting into all kinds of mischief as a volunteer in the educational world, it has been for me personally one of the most gratifying 12 month periods in my life.

As it enters that mysterious set of years know as "teen-age" it is my hope that 1971-72 somehow added a little to the stature of NASBE and to its reputation as a leader and a full partner among the national educational groups in our country.

It has always been difficult for me to find adequate words and phrases with which to express sincere and heartfelt thanks to colleagues. Nevertheless, I shall try.

First, to our entire professional staff -- all one of it! Howing how I voted as a member of the NASBE Search Committee at the time, may I say with deepest feeling that there has never been a moment that I have regretted my vote at that occasion. David, so many thoughts of appreciation and gratitude for all you have done during our years of association, especially over the past twelve months, now come out, as I look at you, in only two words: "Thank you."

Given the years of intense interest of NASBE in bi-lingual education, debated whether to make this next statement in English or Spanish. The unfailing good humor, vis-a-vis or by telephone, which emanates from Maria Wagoner elicits all manner of warm thanks. Maria, please pardon my New York accent. "Salud y pesetas, y el tiempo para gastarlas. Muchas gracias."

To the multitude of the friends in every part of the United States, to the very dedicated members of State Boards whom I am proud to know as good friends: thank you all for the opportunity you have given me, and for your loyal and unwavering support.

Based upon the strong foundation left by my predecessor, it has been my privilege, hopefully, to strengthen further not only the concept of substantial lay contribution to policy-making in education in general, but also to enhance the reputation and influence of NASBE in particular. As the NASBE school bell passes to your distinguished and able president-elect, I can do no more than wish her as invigorating and fruitful year as I have enjoyed. I promise you and her my full support.

To each and everyone of you good luck and God speed in the cause of "excellence in education."

Address Delivered By
GOVERNOR ROBERT D. RAY
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 18, 1972

Thank you very much, Mr. President, and all distinguished people here at the headtable. I am always pleased when someone introduces me kindly. I went to a meeting not long ago and the Master of Ceremonies, the day before I made my appearance, called my office and made notes of the scheduling, and he said, "You know I have never introduced a governor before and I would like to know what the protocol is and what I should say." The girls said well the Governor really would appreciate it if you didn't give any of that biographical information or all that old stuff, but if you would just say something like, "Ladies and gentlemen, the Governor of the State of Iowa" he would be very pleased. So when he came to the moment, and started to introduce me, he just said, "yesterday I called the Governor's office because I had never introduced a governor before and I didn't know the protocol and wanted to know just what I should say, and I was told the less said about the governor, the better.

You, of course, know there are a lot of pressures inserted upon you, and I thought maybe you would feel a little better to know that the same exists with governors. I picked up this letter that I received a short time ago and I was rather amused. It starts out,

> "Dear Governor Ray Sir: I know you are a busy person but do you know of a way I could make about $350.00 fast? I need it for a mini-bike. All of my friends have one, and now none of them will talk to me. My Mom and Dad can't afford to buy one, but they say I can buy one with my own money. Me and my sister both want one of our own. We each have about $60.00 in the bank and want a new bike awfully bad. We would have to put that $60.00 back in the bank, and we can't think of a way to make $290.00 plus put that $60.00 back in the bank."

(Now you want to know about the pressure, listen to this)

> "My parents voted for you."

We got a lot of demands. I want to read just one more letter to you if I may. This one says,

> "Dear Governor Ray: Now that my husband expired, a nice educated business man, after raising an educated son and two daughters, who are now married, and hold responsible positions, I find myself all alone. Now Governor, I am totally aware that you are not an official of the lonely-hearts club, but if you know of a bachelor in government, or perhaps a widower in your state, or any state, hopefully connected with government who is secure, would you please have them get in touch with me. I could be of much help to a high ranking government official, and offer companionship and passion. What I would like is a man who would treat me as if I were the voter and he was the candidate."

I haven't answered the letter, so if there any bachelors here who might like to, you may get in touch with her.

Well, I am certainly glad that NASBE selected Des Moines, Iowa for your conference. I am particularly pleased that our people in the department of public instruction can host you. I have had nothing but good comments from the few persons who have stopped me in the hall, and talked to me here. We are proud of the board members who have served and volunteered for these very important positions. Particularly we are pleased that you recognized Mrs. Shepard, who will do an outstanding job for you, along with Mrs. Krotz in this upcoming period of time.

It was almost 2000 years ago that a great philosopher observed, and I am sure everyone here knows this truth, and that is - "only the educated are free." This brings to mind a truism. H.G. Wells, did not overstate when he declared that "history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophy" it is with these thoughts in mind, that you who make up the state boards of education, realize that you are engaged in a very serious and a very important business.

The nature of the educational business is rapidly changing. The revolutionary aspect of this change is documented in one of the most important publications to come to the printing press this year. The 1972 census report about birth expectations shows a swift and massive change in American attitudes about the most practical family size. The report shows we have become a nation with two children families instead of three children families. There has been a lot of talk in the

area of changing life-styles. But, the change from three children, to two children families, is in fact a life-style change of far greater impact than even the drug and bare-feet permissive culture which have captured the headlines. This change involves most areas of our lives. Effected by this birth dearth are prosperity, eating habits, housing, occupations, just to name a few.

For example take school taxes - the onset of the birth reduction can mean a long stretch of time, when society is producing fewer tax users in proportion to tax payers. Children are vicious tax users. Children not born consume no taxes. Moreover, combine that with the fact that the largest crop of tax users, the baby-boom babies of the late 40's, and early 60's are now becoming tax payers, and you get a multiplying effect. In other words, it means increasing numbers of people to pay taxes, with decreasing numbers of people who need school taxes, namely the children. In short, there will be one half million American school children entering first grade in 1973 than entered first grade in 1970.

In Iowa today, there are more high school seniors than kindergarten kids. In some districts, there are almost twice as many seniors. The declining enrollments are one fact in educational life. There are others. Your work as state boards may be further complicated and affected by supreme court decisions in cases which are presently pending. One example is the one man, one vote principle, followed by the election of local school board members, from districts of unequal population. Here in Iowa, 45 percent of the districts, select their directors at large, and only 13 percent select directors exclusively on a sub-district basis. In other districts, there isn't even pretense of adhering to the one-man, one-vote principle. Then, of course, the big and important public school issue now is before the United States Supreme Court, the Rodriguez case from Texas which poses the question: "Must state boards of education insist that poor school district receive the same amount of total funding per pupil as wealthy school districts with larger tax bases?" I am sure you people here have heard the arguments pro and con on this particular issue and everyone needs to be aware, however, that the equalization concept will affect school boards, taxpayers, students and everyone in education in general all across this country. But regardless of the decisions of the Rodriguez case or any others, there is a continuing need to shift away from dependence on the property tax for financing local schools.

During this biannual period, we in Iowa have taken steps in this direction by going into a foundation plan for financing education. This plan does not allow additional spending for

support of schools to come from property tax, but providing for additional growth through state taxes. This is a plan where the percentage of property tax support for schools coming from local effort will continue to reduce and the percentage coming from the state will continue to increase. I can tell you from experience that such a plan is not an easy one to accomplish, but the result is so necessary that it is worth the battles one goes through. As with the need for de-emphasis of property taxes, I am also convinced of a need for emphasis on career training and career planning by our students. These are important, because a good education should also include knowledge of what to do with it.

As one great philosopher remarked, "Education never hurt anybody who was willing to learn something afterwards." Someone else said that education has really only one basic factor - "a person must want it." Most people will only want it if we relate education to life. Here in Iowa we are facing up to this challenge in several ways, one of them being a project, sponsored by the Iowa State University. It will acquaint students with the world of work, and to help them prepare earlier for careers. We think it is unique. It begins at the kindergarten level and continues through the 12th grade. The project moves through four successive phases of which the first is awareness. The young child is helped to know himself, and his capabilities. At the same time, he becomes aware of the world of work. During the second phase, the child begins to relate what he knows about the world of work, with what he knows about himself. In junior high school, the youngster moves through the exploration phase. During this time, he begins to look at careers that appeal to hi, and hopefully he will begin to match his skills and capabilities, so he can choose the appropriate senior high school courses.

In that final or preparation phase, the student narrows his choices of careers, or possible careers to one or two. This career preparation project has been tested now in nine Iowa schools of various sizes and different parts of the state. It is not an attempt to change the curricula of those schools but to enrich the instruction being provided in their present curricula. Emphasis remains on the development of basic skills but with a special orientation to the application of those skills. It is recognition of the fact that more than 90 percent of what a person learns in his lifetime, he learns outside of the schoolroom. That makes your responsibility as a school board member, even more demaning. Since you must helpt these students get a very solid first ten percent so that the other 90 percent can be built on that solid ten percent.

Today, as you close down this conference, I would like to urge you to use your positions of great power to animate our whole educational process with flexibility and a pioneering spirit. Let us enthusiastically acknowledge the truth that a student has to learn for himself. He can be motivated, he can be inspired, he can be helped over difficulties -- but no one can pour knowledge into him. Acting upon this knowledge, let us explore new uses for those modern resources which have enabled education to break its ancient, rigid patterns -- such resources as language laboratories, television, computers, motion pictures, cassettes, film strips, microfilm, and so on. In part because of them, we no longer have to divide the school day into fixed periods; or the school year into semesters or terms. No longer do we have to march all students through the same routines.

Today, we have the means to provide freedom to learn, and adjustment to individual differences; we have the means to let each student progress at his own speed.

Let us have the courage to use these means; let us have the courage to make education a lifelong and freeing experience rather than a restricted and imprisoning experience.

I want to compliment you people on your loyalty and your efforts to make the educational process meaningful, and for your willingness to see that youngsters are provided the kind of educational opportunities that will build them for a better future, for your states and our state and for this nation. Thank you very much.

Address Delivered By
VIRLA R. KROTZ
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa
October 18, 1972

At this moment I also want to thank my special traveling companion, Mr. Donald P. Krotz. Without his backing, I couldn't possibly do the job that is ahead of me, nor could I have done the job up until this time. Last night, for instance he put me in the room and wouldn't let me out. A party was planned for me, but my husband forbade my attendance. I started losing my voice during the banquet and by the time the banquet was over I was whispering, and because of Don now I believe my voice will stay with me until we are through. Without a doubt what I needed was a locked door and rest. So you see you have someone who takes care of your president when she needs it and doesn't have very good sense of her own.

NASBE is 13 years old, now. After this length of time it is well to review our past and Carl Pforzheimer told us a little bit about it last night. For those of you who have attended many conventions and have been with us for a long time, it brings back nostalgic memories. It is like a reunion to come back to the convention and see old friends that we see only once or twice a year and we look forward to it. But we have many new faces, and I am so happy about that. Let's be sure that we keep new people coming and we don't have a closed fraternity. The strength of an organization is the vitality that new people bring to NASBE. I welcome all of you who are new this time and perhaps you will be interested in hearing some of our background.

As most of you know, for many years we were part of the National School Boards Association. In fact, you probably have the same difficulty that I have. People, when you say you are a member of the State Board of Education, ask if I know somebody in some other town who is a member of a local board. It is very hard for people to keep in their minds the difference between state boards of education and the local school boards.

Local boards have had for a number of years a very active national organization, of which we were a part, but 13 years ago it became apparent that their interests were different from ours. While local board members are concerned with the local operations and local schools, we were concerned with statewide policy making. It was deemed wise to have a separate organization. Thus NASBE was started first in a very small

way. We have a list of past presidents which I'll not go through. With the exception of one all are still alive, and as Carl mentioned last night, all but two are here at this convention. I'm looking forward to their continued cooperation, support, and help and certainly I'm going to need it.

The organization started slowly. The first president built a very firm basis on which we have operated since. We have developed into one of the more important organizations, we feel, of the Big Six. It is interesting, to see the three leading lay organizations moving ahead and working together, the National Congress of Parents & Teachers Association, the National School Boards Association and our organization, The membership and leadership in this combination is truly significant. In addition to this, the federal agencies are frequently looking to NASBE for opinions on vital issues. We are in an era of increasing importance of the states in education. How fortunate that NASBE is able to move with that trend and help and fill the needs of states. We like to think of NASBE as a growing child and it is logical that we should, because we are considering education. We had a happy normal birth, by our parent, the National School Boards Association. We are a healthy child, well learned, and growing steadily. And I think we have passed through our adolescence.

We went through an adolescent period, when we reached out into new fields and tried new skills. These past few years we have realized our potentials and through effort tested them and made many new contacts. Now I believe we are entering maturity. We will continue to develop in the areas where we have real potential, both in federal and state relations and through our meetings on education. There are rapid changes occurring in the federal department of education. We must be ready to adjust to these as they happen. We will continue the excellent program of cooperation with other organizations.

The prestige of our organization has greatly increased during the past, partly because of Carl Pforzheimer's unique ability and personal contacts, which I sincerely hope he will continue to give. You have a right to ask, what does she expect of (the members). All of the things that have been carried on this past year can go ahead because they are good programs, but on the other hand we hope to concentrate even more on making this a service organization to each state board member and each state board in our nation. As a speaker at one of our regional conferences pointed out this Spring, an organization can't truly lead without also giving service. As I travel about over this nation and I discuss the value of membership of NASBE to the state boards at their meetings, invariably after being impressed with the stature that has

been so sharply nurtured, they return to the original point - what can NASBE do for the sake of board members of our state? With 50 different state organizations and limited by our small staff and budget, obviously there are limitations to what can be done. However, let us explore together to see if there is a real need here to make NASBE a truly cooperative organization for state boards of education.

NASBE is the only coordinating agency available to all state boards of education. Education is truly considered primarily the responsibility of the states and action should be at the state level. A great deal can be gained for each state board of education by the sharing of ideas, problems and achievements. We can be of mutual assistance to each other. As stated in a recent paper "joint efforts and mutual development of new activity enlarges the power of states and localities."

An important goal for this next year is to build our usefulness through mutual sharing. To do this, we must know each other better. This is going to be a very friendly administration. The other officers and I want to know you better and we want to have the opportunity of [illegible]ng with each other. This will be the prime purpose of our regional meetings. Please let me know what you would like to have considered there because traveling distances to regional meetings is shorter and practically no time is spent on inactive business. We should have programs that would attract many more board members from surrounding states. How would you suggest that we do this? Our attendance has been disappointing. I want you to help think of ways to improve it. This convention has been outstanding - I'm sure you will all agree. There should have been a greater attendance. I am sure that if we would each go home from this convention telling all the other members of our boards what we have learned, the outstanding events, and the reasons we feel they should attend the next one, we would have a bigger convention. I hope that each state board member, attending the regional conferences this next year will take a far more active part than in the past - each one of you. I hope you will return to your individual states not only sold on NASBE, but filled with new and stimulating ideas for the improvement of your own state board of education and for increasing the roll of state boards. To do this will require the interest and support of every one of you. I will need the support of each of you - NASBE belongs to very one of you. It can be what you want it to be. Let's work together to make it what you think it should be.

When we meet together in Portland, Oregon, next October, let's make a report that jointly we have made this the best year that NASBE has ever had. Together we can do that.

APPENDIX I

Minutes of Annual Business Meeting

1972-73 Budget

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
2480 West 26th Avenue, Suite 215-B
Denver, Colorado 80211

MINUTES

Annual Business Meeting
October 18, 1972
Des Moines, Iowa
Hotel Fort Des Moines

The Annual Business Meeting of the National Association of State Boards of Education was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by President Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. A roll call was made of all the voting delegates by Cynthia W. Cunningham, the Credentials Committee Chairman showing 37 voting delegates present and 14 absent.

Resolutions Committee Report

Richard L. Bye, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, read the resolutions (appended along with supplementary report).

72-1 - Federal Financing of Education. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Jesse H. Bankston of Louisiana. The motion was carried with four opposed, Nebraska, Texas, Colorado and Oregon.

72-2 - Advisory Committees Required by Federal Statute. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Allen B. Lamb of Colorado. The motion was carried unanimously.

72-3 - Legislation for Educational Program. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd of New Jersey. The motion was carried unanimously.

72-4 - Equality of Educational Opportunity. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Harold H. Crist of Kansas. The motion was carried with Colorado opposed.

72-5 - National Institute for Education. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Virla R. Krotz of California and Esther R. Landa of Utah. The motion was carried unanimously.

72-6 - Cabinet Level Department of Education. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of resolution as amended in

supplementary report, seconded by Allen B. Lamb of Colorado. The motion was carried with Texas opposed.

72-7 - State Organization. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Allen B. Lamb of Colorado. The motion was carried unanimously.

72-8 - State Revision of Public Schools Finance. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd of New Jersey. Cynthia W. Cunningham of Nevada moved, seconded by Ernest Whaley of Georgia, to amend the resolution to the wording as originally printed in the July FOCUS. The amendment passed with 12 states opposed. The motion was carried unanimously.

72-9 - Public Funds and Non-Public Schools. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd of New Jersey and Allen B. Lamb of Colorado. The motion was carried unanimously.

72-10 - Performance Accountability. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by James W. Harvey of Texas. The motion passed unanimously.

72-11 - Teacher Preparation and Renewal. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Allen B. Lamb of Colorado. Esther R. Landa of Utah moved an amendment to change the words "the professional" from 9th line before the word "renewal" to the 4th line, part "(1) after the word "and". Part (1) should then read, "further strengthening of preparation for and the professional renewal of those in the teaching profession." Motion was seconded by Allen B. Lamb of Colorado. The motion was carried with Hawaii opposed.

72-12 - Mobility of Educators. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Esther R. Landa of Utah. The motion was carried with two opposed, Georgia and Colorado, and Nevada abstaining.

72-13 - Student Participation - Educational Governance. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Francis I. Smith of Oregon. The motion passed unanimously.

72-14 - Right to Read. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Elise Grossman of Delaware. The motion was carried unanimously.

72-15 - Career Education. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd of New Jersey. The motion passed unanimously.

72-15b - Consumer Education. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of this new resolution from the supplementary report which should be added as 72-15b, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd of New Jersey, thus making the previous resolution 72-15a. Motion carried with two opposed, North Dakota and Vermont.

72-16 - Foreign Language/Bilingual Education. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Allen B. Lamb of Colorado. Allen B. Lamb moved, seconded by Allen P. Burkhardt of Nebraska that last line of resolution be removed. Amendment was defeated with five states voting in favor and 32 states opposed. Calvin J. Hurd of New Jersey moved acceptance, seconded by Gorton Riethmiller of Michigan to insert the word "their" in place of the word "the" in front of the words "primary language" on line 10 and also in the last line instead of the word "a" in front of the word "second." The amendment carried with four opposed, Texas, Oregon, Vermont and North Dakota. The motion carried unanimously.

72-17 - Early Childhood Education. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Isabelle B. Thomasson of Alabama. The motion carried with Colorado abstaining.

72-18 - School Food Services. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Allen B. Lamb of Colorado. The motion was carried unanimously.

72-19 - Environmental Education. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Helen B. Ure of Utah. The motion carried with Colorado opposed.

72-20 - Communication - Technology. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Francis I. Smith of Oregon. The motion carried unanimously.

72-21 - History, Culture and Language of the Non-Western World. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Perce J. Ross of West Virginia. The motion was carried unanimously.

72-22 - Drug Abuse/Venereal Disease Education. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by James W. Harvey of Texas. Dana R. Darling of Maine moved, seconded by Cynthia W. Cunningham of Nevada that the word "alcohol" be inserted in the title so as to read, "Alcohol Drug Abuse/Venereal Disease Education." The amendment passed with nine states opposed. The motion carried unanimously.

72-23 - Year-Around Use of School Facilities. Richard L. Bye moved acceptance, seconded by Ernest Whaley of Georgia. The motion passed unanimously.

(1972 corrected resolutions appended)

Courtesy Resolution. A courtesy resolution was read by Richard L. Bye. James W. Harvey of Texas moved acceptance, seconded unanimously. (appended)

Budget and Finance Report. James H. Jones, Jr., Chairman of the Budget and Finance Committee moved acceptance, seconded by Allen B. Lamb of Colorado of the budget and finance report. The motion passed unanimously. (Budget and Finance report appended) (Report of Finance Committee's Recommendations also appended)

By-Laws Committee Report. Virla R. Krotz, Chairman of the By-Laws Committee moved acceptance, seconded by Francis I. Smith of Oregon of the Board of Directors meetings recommendation to delete a), b), and c) on page 6, subparagraph 4) Board of Directors. Also under a) delete first sentence, "The Board of Directors shall hold its annual meeting immediately following the annual convention." The motion carried unanimously. (Corrected wording appended)

Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. thanked the By-Laws Committee for the wonderful work done in 1971-72.

Report of Area Vice-Presidents and Future Area Meetings.

Western Area Vice-President Ruth Tabrah reported that Cynthia W. Cunningham of Nevada was elected Western Area Vice-President for the year 1972-73. The area conference will be held at the Broadmoor Hotel, Colorado Springs, Colorado on April 1-3, 1973.

Southern Area Vice-President Perce J. Ross reported that Isabelle B. Thomasson of Alabama was elected Southern Area Vice-President for the year 1972-73. The area conference will be held at the Grand Hotel of Point Clear, Alabama on March 11-13, 1973.

Northeast Area Vice-President Robert H. McBride reported that Calvin J. Hurd of New Jersey was elected Northeast Area Vice-President for the year 1972-73. The area conference will be held in Princeton, New Jersey on April 29-30 and May 1, 1973.

Central Area Vice-President Dr. Allen P. Burkhardt reported that Harry O. Lytle, Jr. of Kansas was elected Central Area

Vice-President for the year 1972-73. The area conference will be held in Kansas and the dates will be set in the next meeting of the Board of Directors.

Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. thanked the Area Vice-Presidents for all the wonderful work they did during 1971-72.

Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. thanked the 1971-72 directors-at-large for the wonderful work they did in the past year.

Report of Nominations Committee. James H. Rowland, Sr., Chairman of the Nominations Committee read the slate of nominated officers. He moved acceptance of the report, seconded by Allen B. Lamb of Colorado, and Wayne Shaffer of Ohio and asked that the Secretary-Treasurer cast a unanimous ballot for the slate and that the new officers be declared elected. The motion carried unanimously.

Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. thanked the Nominating Committee for the wonderful work done during the year 1971-72.

The annual business was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
Tentative Budget
November 1, 1972 - October 31, 1973

ESTIMATED INCOME

Dues collected	$ 48,850	
Dues outstanding	26,700	
Estimated Interest Income	1,800	
Total estimated income		$ 77,350

EXPENDITURES

Headquarters Staff:		
Executive Secretary Salary	$ 24,000	
Clerical Salary	7,000	
Employee Benefits (1)	4,700	
Headquarters Maintenance:		
Office Rent	4,200	
Office Expense (2)	7,500	
Audit	450	
Bond Insurance	275	
Travel:		
Officers, Board, Staff, Committees	17,000	
Publications:		
FOCUS and Interim Newsletters	4,250	
Meetings:		
Annual Convention	2,500	
Area Conferences	3,000	
Contingency Reserve (3)	2,475	
Total expenditures		$ 77,350

NOTE:

(1) Includes Social Security Tax
(2) Includes maintenance and repair of equipment
(3) Available cash savings at November 1, 1972, to start the new fiscal year are estimated at $13,225.52.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
2480 W. 26th Avenue - Suite 215-B
Denver, Colorado 80211

FINANCIAL REPORT - BUDGET YEAR 1971-72

November 1, 1971 to October 6, 1972

	Budget	Collected
Dues	$ 70,470.00	$ 70,470.00
Interest and Other Income	1,800.00	2,809.32
	$ 72,270.00	$ 73,279.32

EXPENSES

	Expended	Balance	Budget
Executive Secretary	$ 20,166.63	$ 1,833.37	$ 22,000.00
Clerical Salary	6,035.00	565.00	6,600.00
Employee Benefits	3,560.57	939.43	4,500.00
Office Rent	3,384.16	215.84	3,600.00
Office Expenses	6,689.44	(189.44)	6,500.00
Travel	12,385.90	3,614.10	16,000.00
Publications	3,771.05	(21.05)	3,750.00
Annual Convention	1,888.26	611.74	2,500.00
Big Six	1,800.00	- 0 -	1,800.00
Area Conferences (including unbudgeted income	971.36	2,028.64	3,000.00
Audit	400.00	- 0 -	400.00
Bond insurance	250.00	- 0 -	250.00
Contingency Reserve	416.20	953.80	1,370.00
	$ 61,718.57	$ 10,551.43	$ 72,270.00

			Cash received
Project V Grant	$ 9,451.72	$ 2,209.00	$ 11,660.72

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
2480 W.26th Ave. - Suite 215-B
Denver, Colorado 80211

FINANCIAL REPORT
Cash Summary

Cash in Bank (checking acct.)	$ 11,281.71
Passbook savings	1,405.14
Savings & Loan Certificates	55,000.00
Total Cash on hand	$ 67,686.85
Dues collectable	26,700.00
Total Cash	$ 94,386.85
Less estimated expenses Oct. 9-31, 1972	3,811.33
Estimated Total Cash available 1972-73	$ 90,575.52
Budget 1972-73	- 77,350.00
Total Cash end of 1971-72	$ 13,225.52

Budgeted Liabilities

Dues collected for 1972-73	$ 48,850.00
Estimated budgeted expenses, Oct.9-31,1972	3,811.33
	$ 52,661.33

Executive Secretary	$ 1,833.33
Clerical Salary	550.00
Employee Benefits	464.20
Office Expenses	120.00
Travel	520.00
Publications	220.00
Convention	400.00
	$ 3,811.33

APPENDIX II

Courtesy Resolution

#1

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

COURTESY RESOLUTION

Adopted at the 1972 Annual Business Meeting
of the National Association of State Boards of Education
Des Moines, Iowa, October 18, 1972

WHEREAS, the signal success of the 1972 NASBE annual convention in Des Moines has been the result of extensive and detailed planning and coordination by the Iowa Board of Public Instruction and the Iowa Department of Public Instruction; and

WHEREAS, this outstanding convention has been noteworthy for the hospitality, friendship and enthusiasm extended to the delegates by our hosts,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Association of State Boards of Education commends and congratulates President Muriel I. Shepard and the members of the Iowa Board of Public Instruction and Superintendent Robert D. Benton and the staff of the Iowa Department of Public Instruction for their dedication, enthusiasm and cordiality without which this convention would not have been possible.

RESOLVED, that the National Association of State Boards of Education expresses its sincere appreciation to the Izaak Walton League and to Ward Bus Company whose facilities and hospitality made Iowa Night a signal success.

APPENDIX III

Resolutions

#1-23

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

NASBE

RESOLUTIONS 1972

PUBLISHED BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING, OCTOBER 18, 1972, DES MOINES, IOWA

The National Association of State Boards of Education continues to assert its belief in the youth of this country and the force of free public education in maintaining and shaping our American way of life. Free public education, to remain responsive to the needs of our youth, must:

1.) Continue to prepare students for responsible, productive citizenship creating a clear understanding of our democratic process and of our economic system.

2.) Create awareness of and respect for the rights of others irrespective of race, creed, or sex, and an appreciation of our American Heritage.

3.) Be the result of citizen participation at all levels of educational concern in order to reflect effectively the issues and needs of youth and of the community.

4.) Continue to recognize the fundamental importance of the role of the teacher and to maintain and improve the quality of teaching.

In the area of the federal relationship to public elementary and secondary education:

72-1

FEDERAL FINANCING OF EDUCATION

The increased mobility of our population and the increased dependency upon education for national success and progress demand that the sources of revenue supporting public education be more broadly based. Therefore, specific federal legislative proposals should take into account several factors of major import:

A. A critical need exists to increase significantly the level of federal funding of public education through general aid. The total share of federal support of education should be increased to at least 1/3 of total education expenditures within the next 3-year period.

B. Supplemental categorical programs directed to legitimate areas of unique federal responsibility and overriding problems of national concern must receive a higher priority of federal support and must be fully funded.

C. Funds must be distributed on an equitable basis which takes into consideration need, effort expended, and financial resources available at the state and local levels. The primary responsibility for determining specific expenditures should rest with local school districts where needs are best evaluated.

D. All funds from the federal government should be received and administered by the legally constituted state educational agencies, which together with local school districts should develop procedures to ensure accountability and effective use of federal monies to improve the education of all children.

The National Association of State Boards of Education urges that all applicable federal legislation be amended to provide for a minimum of a three-year authorization, with funds to be appropriated one year in advance on a level at least equal to the appropriation of the previous year.

The National Association of State Boards of Education supports enabling legislation for packaging of categorical grants, pursuant to state plans, for more effective use of such funds, providing that criteria governing individual federal programs be retained.

72-2

ADVISORY COMMITTEES REQUIRED BY FEDERAL STATUTE

The National Association of State Boards of Education urges the Congress to re-examine the principles upon which federally mandated state and

local level advisory groups have been established. Moreover, the Association urges that the functions of these groups and the method by which members are selected also be examined.

The Association believes that such advisory groups, whether created by Congress or otherwise, should be advisory to the responsible state agency and should not engage in administrative functions which tend to duplicate and impinge upon those for which a constitutional or statutory state agency is responsible.

72-3

LEGISLATION FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The National Association of State Boards of Education requests the Congress and state legislatures to pass educational authorization and appropriation bills with provisions exclusively associated with the educational objects and programs for which the appropriations are intended. Legislative or executive actions intended to mitigate the effects of judicial decisions or related judicial reforms should be the subjects of independent legislation or executive action.

72-4

EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

The right to equality of educational opportunity is not a function of geography. The National Association of State Boards of Education calls upon its members in all parts of the nation uniformly to apply the principles which enhance equality of educational opportunity for the nation's children, whether related to race, economic status, or the wealth of a school district and to recognize that application of these principles may justify changes such as revised school attendance areas, pairing of schools, closing of some schools and additional pupil transportation in order to provide quality education for all children.

The National Association of State Boards of Education recognizes that compliance with emerging constitutional concepts frequently imposes increased costs upon local districts and state agencies. These costs, when born solely by these agencies, frequently divert sorely needed local funds from the classroom to non-educational functions. The National Association of State Boards of Education, therefore, urges Congress to provide substantial financial assistance to defray these costs within restriction as to the use of the funds.

72-5

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION

The National Association of State Boards of Education agrees in concept with the National Institute of Education. This Institute can do much to promote research and development in the field of education.

The Association feels it important that the National Institute of Education coordinate its effort with those of the United States Office of Education. Furthermore, the Association believes that responsible laymen, including members of State Boards of Education, should be included in any governing body of the National Institute.

72-6

CABINET LEVEL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

While applauding the statutory creation of an Assistant Secretary for Education for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Association of State Boards of Education continues to urge that Congress and the President of the United States establish a cabinet level Department of Education to maintain equitable and effective coordination and administration of all federally supported education programs. To secury lay participation in the educational processes, the National Association of State Boards of Education further recommends that a National Advisory Committee on education be appointed by the President.

In the area of State and local relationships to education:

72-7

STATE ORGANIZATION

The National Association of State Boards of Education believes that for the most efficient and effective administration of state educational programs, major policy and supervisory responsibility should be placed in the hands of a state board of education composed primarily of lay citizens, and that included in the responsibilities of that board be the authority to appoint the Chief State School Officer. The Association draws particular attention to Resolution 72-2 above and deplores any federal action mandating how any state should organize its internal management of educational affairs.

72-8

STATE REVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE

The National Association of State Boards of Education urges its members to review the equity, effectiveness and impact of state support and funding systems and to exercise leadership to bring about changes in per pupil allocations that will promote equal education for each child.

Recognizing that responsive public education depends upon lay direction at the local level, the Association nevertheless urges its members towards a greater measure of state participation in the cost

of public elementary and secondary education, utilizing sources of revenue other than regressive taxes.

72-9

PUBLIC FUNDS AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The National Association of State Boards of Education believes that the foundation of our American system of education is free public education. The Association, therefore, opposes the use of public funds, tax deductions, tax credits, voucher plans or other programs to support non-public education under any circumstances which would jeopardize the welfare, stability, or adequate support of the system of public education.

72-10

PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY

The National Association of State Boards of Education believes that public education should and must be held accountable for its results.

The Association further believes that state educational agencies should provide prime leadership in the evaluation of all programs which involve student time and public funds, whether innovative, experimental or traditional.

Also, the Association believes state education agencies should encourage the development of methods of accounting to the public which will improve efficiency, raise quality, and thereby sustain the public confidence in, and commitment to education.

The Association further believes that planning, research, development and evaluation are essential elements in the formulation of policies by state boards of education, and therefore, state agencies are encouraged to create specialized units for such purposes.

72-11

TEACHER PREPARATION AND RENEWAL

Recognizing that inspired and creative teaching is the most important single ingredient in the educational process, The National Association of State Boards of Education urges: (1) further strengthening of preparation for and the professional renewal of those in the teaching profession; (2) further exploration of performance criteria to be used in the evaluation of the student of education and the established teacher; and (3) a continuation and expansion of the process of cooperative planning for renewal programs between U.S. Office of Education, State and local educational agencies, and teacher training institutions.

72-12

MOBILITY OF EDUCATORS

The National Association of State Boards of Education endorses in principle the Interstate Certification Project and Reciprocal Retirement plans for educators.

This endorsement assumes that legislative implementation will maintain and permit improvement of standards and qualifications for teacher certification, and will result in actuarially sound retirement plans.

72-13

STUDENT PARTICIPATION—EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

America's democratic system is rooted in the belief that all citizens who are affected by the system should have a voice in the operation of the system.

The National Association of State Boards of Education reaffirms its support of the concept of student participation with state and local boards of education, and it encourages citizens to implement concept.

72-14

RIGHT TO READ

The National Association of State Boards of Education supports nationwide efforts to erase functional illiteracy in the United States. The Association encourages state and local boards of education to implement necessary teacher training programs and to use varied and effective techniques to the end that every person be able to read. The National Association of State Boards of Education urges legislation creating a federally funded reading program administered through the legally constituted state educational agencies.

In the area of Program:

72-15a

CAREER EDUCATION

Career education is concerned with the productive lives of citizens. It should begin in and be an integral part of elementary and secondary education and should:

A. Provide each student with motivation to learn.

B. Provide awareness of the world of work.

C. Prepare every student for a satisfying career in the world of work.

D. Provide guidance and counseling to assist in intelligent choices of a career.

72-15b

CONSUMER EDUCATION

Consumer education is concerned with the utilization of products and services. It should begin and be an integral part of elementary and secondary

education and should:

A. Provide a growing awareness of the intricacies of our economic system and structure.

B. Promote an understanding of the need for sound fiscal management of personal and public resources.

C. Prepare students as intelligent users of goods and services.

D. Involve all aspects of the school curriculum as well as teacher preparation and renewal in this area as well as others.

72-16

FOREIGN LANGUAGE/BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The teaching of foreign languages in the public schools is commendable. The National Association of State Boards of Education believes, however, that this instruction frequently leaves students short of fluency. The National Association of State Boards of Education, therefore, supports foreign language instruction which leads to conversational fluency.

The National Association of State Boards of Education further recognizes that for millions of Americans, English is not their primary language and instruction in a foreign tongue may be necessary for effective educational communication. In such cases it is imperative that English be taught as their second language.

72-17

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Growing evidence shows the importance of early childhood education. The National Association of State Boards of Education urges that Congress increase financial assistance to public schools for the encouragement of early childhood development programs. Further we support provisions for parents' participation in planning and supervision, and the use of work with the children as opportunity for parent education.

72-18

SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES

The National Association of State Boards of Education urges the continued expansion of school food services in all public schools of the United States. It further urges the federal government to expand programs which provide food either at a minimal cost, or free, to children who need it and to maintain present percentage levels of federal participation.

72-19

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

Never before has there been such a great need for increasing the efforts of humanity to preserve natural quality of life on this planet. Pollution, the misuse of natural resources, the possible extinction of some living species and the destruction of other living things are crucial social problems.

The National Association of State Boards of Education re-emphasizes its plea to all with responsibility and authority in matters of education to urge the development and implementation of programs in ecology and conservation of natural resources in the schools of this country.

72-20

COMMUNICATION-TECHNOLOGY

The National Association of State Boards of Education urges: (1) greater use of educational communication technology which enhances our ability to disseminate information and to provide widespread educational opportunities, and (2) the allocation of funds to develop personnel, material and equipment to assure effective educational utilization of this technology and evaluation of the results of its application to education.

72-21

HISTORY, CULTURE AND LANGUAGES OF THE NON-WESTERN WORLD

Because of its position of leadership, the United States has responsibilities in all parts of the globe and our citizens need new knowledge, understanding, and skills commensurate with our international role. Therefore, the National Association of State Boards of Education encourages adding to the curricula the culture, history and languages of the non-western world, to the end that our people will have knowledge of, and understand all peoples and traditions.

72-22

ALCOHOL DRUG ABUSE/VENEREAL DISEASE EDUCATION

The illicit use of drugs and harmful chemicals is widespread, and venereal disease has reached epidemic proportions. Both represent serious threats to the learning capacities of the nation's youth and to the future stability of the nation itself. The National Association of State Boards of Education endorses immediate implementation of programs of sound comprehensive classroom instruction and health services designed to fully and honestly inform and protect students from the dangerous effects of the abuse of body health.

72-23

YEAR-AROUND USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

The National Association of State Boards of Education advocates full year-around use of school facilities for all educational and other compatible programs in communities.